

Cuk-140 65 ~~80~~ -85- P16554

THE

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW

85

VOLUME XCIII. - JANUARY—JUNE, 1908.

852-0

LONDON:

HORACE MARSHALL & SON,

TEMPLE HOUSE, TEMPLE AVENUE,
AND

125, FLEET STREET, E.C.

1908.

PRINTED BY ALABASTER, PASSMORE & SONS,
WHITECROSS STREET, LONDON, E.C., AND MAIDSTONE.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XCIII.

JANUARY, 1908.

	PAGE
The American Panic. By Lord Welby	1
The Coming Famine in India. By Benjamin Aitken	6
Revolution. By Jack London	17
The Religions of Greece and Rome. By E. Agnes P. Haigh	32
Belgium and the Congo. By E. D. Morel	48
The Japanese in Korea. By F. A. McKenzie	55
Poetry and Symbolism: A Study of "The Tempest." By J. Churton Collins	65
Oxford Finance: A Rejoinder. By W. R. Lawson	84
Natal and the Zulus. By R. C. Hawkins	89
The Government and Old Age Pensions. By Harold Spender	94
Foreign Affairs. By Dr. E. J. Dillon	108
Literary Supplement:—	
Christ in English Literature. By "Museum"	1
Reviews of Books: <i>Omnia Exeunt in Mysterium</i> ; A School for Mothers; Lord Acton's <i>Essays and Studies</i> ; Mr. Gosse's New Volume; Hugo Wolf; The Modern Reader's Bible; William Jordan, Junior, etc.	5

FEBRUARY, 1908.

Tariff Reform Methods. By Unionist	129
The Education Question. By the Bishop of Southwark	136
The Coming Education Bill. By Sir George White, M.P.	142
Old-Age Pensions and the Belongingless Poor. By Edith Sellers	147
The Love of Liberty and the Love of Truth. By P. T. Forsyth, D.D.	158
The Growth of the World. By the late Sir Spencer Walpole	171
Belgian Opinion on the Congo Question. By Georges Lorand, <i>Deputy to the Belgian Chamber</i>	182
The Limits of Direct Taxation. By Hilaire Belloc	191
The Fair Complexion. By Frederick Boyle	207
• Christian Missions in China: A Report. By F. W. Fox, Professor Alexander Macalister and Sir Alexander R. Simpson	218
Foreign Affairs. By Dr. E. J. Dillon	236
Literary Supplement:—	
Mr. Scott Lidgett on the Christian Religion. By Dr. A. M. Fairbairn	1
Reviews of Books: Lay Sermons and Addresses; Ellice Hopkins; Tides; Annotated Edition of Tennyson; English Music; William Allingham: A Diary; etc.	6

MARCH, 1908.

The British Army of To-Day. By Major Von Heydebreck	257
My Profession of Faith. By Father Petroff	276
The First of February in Liabon. By Jean Finot	287
Modernism. By Paul Sabatier	300
Arbitration Courts and Wages Boards in Australasia. By J. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P.	308
The German Fleet	326
The Charm of French Verse. By Edward Wright	338
Austria-Hungary, Italy, and the West Balkans. By Scotus Viator	344
The Prospects of Liberalism. By Professor L. T. Hobhouse	349
Sir E. Grey on Capture at Sea. By Sir John Macdonell, C.B.	359
Foreign Affairs. By Dr. E. J. Dillon	365
Literary Supplement:—	
Poetry and Modern Thought. By "Museum"	1
Reviews of Books. Sir Henry Wotton; The Modern Church; Philosophy of Common Sense; Wireless Telephony; Professor Elton's <i>Essays</i> ; Sir George Grey; James Thomson, etc.	4

APRIL, 1908.

	PAGE
Unemployment and its Cure: The First Step. By W. H. Beveridge	385
The American Senate as a Second Chamber. By Prof. Allen Johnson	399
The Present Tendencies of French Literature. By M. Edouard Rod	406
Modern Attacks on Christian Ethics. By J. Kenneth Mozley	423
Lord Cromer and Government by Journalism. By W. T. Stead	436
Education <i>Sub Dio</i> . By J. E. G. de Montmorency	450
The Raising of Lazarus. By Prof. H. M. Gwatkin	457
The Black Art of Vivisection. By the Hon. Stephen Coleridge	460
Can Science Abolish War? By Col. F. N. Maude, C.B.	470
Mechanism and Life. By Prof. Marcus Hartog	478
Foreign Affairs. By Dr. E. J. Dillon	491
Literary Supplement:—	
A New Stage in the Homeric Question. By C. T.	1
Reviews of Books: Lord Cromer and Modern Egypt; The Cities of St. Paul; Dr. Russell Wallace's Book on Mars; Education and National Life; The Awakening of China; Martin Luther's Letters, etc.	6

MAY, 1908.

Affairs in Transition. By J. A. Spender	513
The New Electric Ordinance. By Col. F. N. Maude, C.B.	527
The Ether of Space. By Sir Oliver Lodge	536
The Village "Pub." By D. C. Pedder	547
The Function of Modern Art Criticism. By L. March Phillipps	555
Ancient Wisdom and Modern Knowledge. By Emma Marie Caillard	569
Experiments on Animals. By Stephen Paget	582
The Waste of Daylight. By Sir Algernon West, G.C.B.	592
Christianity in India. By J. N. Farquhar	597
Foreign Affairs. By Dr. E. J. Dillon	617
Literary Supplement:—	
Shakespeare and the Life to Come. By "Museus."	1
Poem: Watchers at the Sepulchre. By A. M. Buckton	6
Reviews of Books: Philology of the Greek Bible; The Oxford Book of French Verse; The History of the West; The Economics of Poverty; Evolution of Tragedy; In Memoriam, etc.	8

JUNE, 1908.

The Financial Aspect of the Licensing Bill. By Sir Thomas P. Whittaker, M.P.	641
Common-Sense about Brewing and the Bill. By Sir Oliver Lodge	653
The Necessary Basis of Society. By Sidney Webb	658
Oxford in the Sixties. By H. E. P. Platt	669
Free Trade and the Late Ministry. By The Right Hon. Thomas Lough, M.P.	679
Ibsen as a Religious Teacher. By Henry Rose	692
The Carnegie Trust and Scottish Universities. By Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L.	709
The Raising of Lazarus. By Professor Burdett	726
Vivisection and Disease. By the Hon. Stephen Coleridge	728
Presence and Omnipresence. By William Scott Palmer	734
Foreign Affairs. By Dr. E. J. Dillon	743
Literary Supplement:—	
Poem: Adeimantus. By A. B. S. Tennyson	1
Reviews of Books: The Pan-Anglican Church; Montague Burrows; Early England; Miss Coleridge's Poems; Egyptian Papyrus, etc.	3

THE AMERICAN PANIC.

THE crisis in the United States gives exceptional opportunity for studying the causes and effects of financial panic.

For a long time the demand for capital had exceeded the supply, and money had been consequently dear. On the other hand, prosperous trade had encouraged speculation. There was, therefore, a certain apprehension as to the future, but during early autumn uneasy glances were directed to Berlin, Hamburg and Amsterdam rather than to New York.

- At the close of September a convention of the National Banks met at Atlantic City in New Jersey. The tone of the experts there assembled was not, on the whole, pessimistic. The financial situation was in their opinion stronger than in the autumn of the previous year, but the late harvest might lead to inconvenient demands for money towards the close of December. Thus, although there was ground for anxiety in the money markets of America and Europe, the financial barometer in America did not point to specially bad weather, and those who would be the first to see from their Carmel the cloud not bigger than a man's hand did not apparently suspect the impending catastrophe.

- On the 20th October the storm broke. The Mercantile National Bank applied to the New York Clearing House for aid, and the Clearing House, after examining its affairs, called on the Board of Directors to resign. The resignation of the Presidents of the Knickerbocker Trust and of other banks with which the Mercantile Bank had been connected followed. These banks had been misusing their deposits in order to promote their own speculative schemes. Later, the National Bank of Commerce gave notice that it could not continue to act as Clearing House agent for the Knickerbocker Trust. This Knickerbocker Trust was not a trade monopoly like the Oil Trust. It was a kind of "bucket shop" bank, competing with legitimate banks, but not like them trammelled and controlled by the provisions of the Banking Law. It enjoyed considerable reputation, and had a large custom. It had been paying its shareholders large dividends, and held deposits to the amount of £12,500,000, which it used freely in its own speculations. It had already lost credit by the enforced resignation of its President, and when the National Bank of Commerce refused to act longer as its agent the public took fright, and a run upon it followed. There was a

repetition of the scenes usual in times of panic. An excited crowd clamoured for a return of their "dough"—a slang Americanism for money. Resort was had to the old device of delay in paying across the counter, but in vain, and in a few hours it closed its doors. This act gave the signal for a general panic, a general run on all banks followed, the public wildly withdrew its money, and hoarded in safes and stockings the cash on which the banks relied to meet the daily demands of their customers. The panic spread from New York throughout the States, with the result that the nation found itself deprived of its waistcoat pocket-money—the money required for all the wants of daily life. Notes and coin had alike disappeared from circulation, and for the moment there was no possibility of supplying the deficiency from other quarters. The United States were reduced to barter, with the great inconvenience that they had for the time being nothing with which to barter.

Energetic steps were taken at once to restore confidence. The Government balance, kept by the Government in gold and in its own hands, constituted in fact a special reserve of gold, and the Secretary of the Treasury came to the relief of the banks by depositing with them a large part of this reserve against securities. Mr. Pierpont Morgan and other financiers formed a pool of \$30,000,000 (£6,000,000), which they employed in loans to the market. The savings banks insisted on their right to thirty days' notice of withdrawal, and deposit banks also required notice before withdrawal. Practically the banks suspended payment. In spite, however, of these measures of safeguard, and of the united efforts of the Government and leading financiers, the panic continued. It tried severely the most important trust company, that of America, but, liberally supported, it stood the trial. The pressure throughout the country was extreme. At San Francisco the Safe Deposit and Trust Company closed its doors, and the Governor of the State proclaimed a legal holiday; in other words, he suspended temporarily all legal liabilities.

The next measure of relief was the issue by the New York Clearing House of "Clearing House certificates." The banks, acting together as a Clearing House Association, agreed to discharge the balances which they owed to one another by certificates, that is, by *promises to pay* instead of by cash payments. Thus the gold, the notes, the Treasury certificates generally used for such adjustments were set free, and added to the general supply of cash required for the daily demands of commerce and of individual needs. These Clearing House certificates are supposed to be confined to members of the Association, but now, as in 1893, they appear to have passed into general circulation.

Early in November the financial situation may be summarised as a general suspension of cash payments by the banks. The run on the banks ceased because the banks declined to cash cheques. Persons presenting cheques received not cash, but cheques against

Clearing House certificates, which might be discounted by brokers, but which would not be paid at the Clearing House. The general dismay throughout all classes, especially the poorer and ignorant classes of the community, may be imagined. A premium on gold, varying from 1 to 4 per cent, naturally followed the suspension of cash payments. The pressure throughout the country was intense, and the demand for gold continued. The *Standard* tells us that a Boston bank is said to have offered a premium of nearly 4 per cent. for the receipts of a football match. By the third week in November the crisis had lasted nearly a month, and showed no signs of abatement. The Government then came once more to the rescue by a scheme intended to increase the note circulation. It must be remembered that banks in the United States can only increase their note issues by obtaining a corresponding amount of Government bonds to be deposited as security. The scheme was as follows. The United States Treasury has power under an Act of Congress to borrow money for the construction of the Panama Canal, and the Government, though in no need of money for that purpose, resolved to borrow under that Act by the issue of £10,000,000 Panama bonds, for which it was intended that the national banks should subscribe. The banks, on their subscriptions being accepted, would send authorised bonds or securities to the Treasury, and would receive Panama bonds in return, against which they could correspondingly increase their note issue. They would retain the price of the bonds as a Government deposit. Thus they would lose no cash, but would increase their note issue, and add correspondingly to the currency in circulation.

Further, a law still in force authorises the Treasury to borrow money for the Spanish war on "certificates of indebtedness." The Government resolved to make use of this obsolete power, and to sell to the public £20,000,000 in "certificates of indebtedness." Banks subscribing for these certificates would, as in the case of the Panama bonds, be able to increase their note issue. Both schemes are remarkable stretches of Treasury powers, and roundabout methods of surmounting the complication of the currency law regulating note issues. It is doubtful, however, whether much above £5,000,000 of the "certificates of indebtedness" has been issued. These measures have been much criticised, and the force of criticism has not been lessened by the fact that up to the present they have not succeeded in restoring credit. The last returns of the New York banks show that the large imports of gold from abroad have been absorbed, and have not materially strengthened the New York reserves. Meantime, trade is disorganised throughout the country. The annihilation of credit and the suspension of cash payments force employers to confine their work within the narrowest limits, and workmen are dismissed. The *New York Journal of Commerce* estimates that in various industries 200,000 men have been paid off, and there is reason for doubting

the sufficiency of their estimate. Unskilled labour is migrating, and wages are without doubt reduced. Widespread distress must be the consequence, and it will be a melancholy Christmas for the whole country.

What have been the causes of this great catastrophe? Commercial crises are, perhaps, more frequent in the United States than in older countries. This is the fifth since 1873. The great resources of the country, the energy and go-ahead character of the people, tempt them into overtrading, with the usual consequences, and it must be added that public opinion is lenient, or to say the least, indolent, in its attitude towards unscrupulous greed for wealth. Wrongdoing is too often lightly passed over as *business*. The result is want of confidence in the probity of those who manage great industrial undertakings. Thus the country is predisposed to alarm, and when bad or trying times come this want of confidence easily degenerates into fright and panic.

But other causes have contributed to the present crisis. It must always be remembered that the capital required to extend business and to open new fields of trade can only be supplied from the *savings of the world*. He is a bold statistician who would attempt to estimate the amount of capital thus yearly made available for the new needs of the world. Take the case of the United Kingdom. There are data for an estimate of our yearly savings, but they are in many respects uncertain, and a large margin must be left for error. The estimates, subject to the above qualification, and varying, of course, with the circumstances of the year, point to a sum annually of (say) £200,000,000 to £250,000,000. This sum, be it more or less, together with similar accumulations in other countries, forms the sole fund by means of which the cost of the *new* work of the world is defrayed. The vast yearly increase of expenditure by States and public bodies is met from the proceeds of these accumulations. They provide the capital ruthlessly destroyed in war, and the capital usefully employed in the work and arts of peace. But there is a limit to these accumulations, large as they are, and if the passions of the world, the extravagance of the world, and, above all, the growing needs of the world, trench too closely on the accumulations of the world, financial stringency will inevitably be the result. Now these causes of stringency have beyond a doubt been largely at work during recent years, often in legitimate, not infrequently in baleful directions. Growing prosperity has made the world extravagant. The South African War and the Russo-Japanese War consumed without return a large amount of capital. The Budgets of great nations such as Germany and Russia are drifting, it may be said, into permanent deficit. On the other hand, trade which does not destroy but creates capital is also putting forward enlarged demands for an increased share of the accumulations. Hence we have seen for some time past

that the demand for capital is greater than can be easily supplied, and that there has been great stringency in the money markets of the world, and money has, as the phrase goes, become dear. This state of things, common to the world, has been specially evident in the United States. That country has prospered beyond measure in legitimate trade, its produce has been enormous, and its people have been energetic, perhaps a trifle more than energetic, in developing its resources. To take a single instance, within the last two or three years railroads have borrowed capital to an unprecedented amount. Two allied lines, the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific, alone are issuing this year £30,000,000 of new stock. Excessive capital expenditure led to pressure on the money market, and the market became sensitive and uneasy long before speculative scandals bred that want of confidence which, on the fall of the Knickerbocker Trust, found expression in panic.

These two causes have jointly led to the crisis, but they must not be confused. The one is general and in the main legitimate, although unduly hastened—namely, the development of the country; the other is special, partial, and illegitimate—namely, over-trading, often fraudulent in its methods.

When the storm is over the first will find its own remedy, and dear money will moderate the pace of development. The second will be cured for the time by the fall of weak sinners and the check given to speculation by the loss of public confidence. It may, however, be doubted whether public opinion in the States is prepared to deal decisively with the mischievous action of great monopolies and of great financiers. The people, busied with the present, soon forgive or forget the past. Want of confidence will gradually pass away, as also the lamentable distress accompanying it. But, apart from these temporary drawbacks, the States were never so prosperous as now; the mass of their business is sound. Trade will be set back for a time, but that will only be a temporary ebb in the flowing prosperity of the country. Would that one could be equally sure that an effective check will be given to the methods by which greed for wealth too often attains its object. One thing is clear. Law cannot stop over-trading; but if commercial finance is to be put on a sound footing the currency system must be reformed. At present the reserve against notes is not gold, and the banks are isolated institutions, incapable of common action in emergency. It should not be difficult to make gold the note reserve, for the stock of gold in the States is enormous. It had risen in thirteen years, from 1894 to 1907, from £93,000,000 to £262,000,000. A central bank would be the obvious remedy for the second defect. Senator Fowler's alternative, the unification and co-ordination of banking interests, is a difficult problem which could not be discussed within the limits of this article.

THE COMING FAMINE IN INDIA.

ALL human hope is now taken away that dire famine can be averted from a section of India embracing two whole provinces and parts of three others. The two provinces are the Punjab and the United Provinces, and the three are Rajpootana, the Central India Agency, and the Central Provinces. The United Provinces are what used to be known, till about five years ago, as the North-Western Provinces and Oudh. They contain the well-known cities of Allahabad, Lucknow, Cawnpore, Benares and Agra. The Central India Agency and Rajpootana are combinations of important Native States under their own Chiefs.

Throughout the great area thus indicated two things have happened: the summer grain-crop has withered, and the winter crop has not been sown. The first means very great scarcity, with famine prices, all through the winter. The second means actual starvation from March till the June rains of 1908. The past monsoon was a month late in coming: instead of coming in June it arrived on the 19th of July. When it came the rainfall was scanty, and it ceased at the end of August instead of going on all through September. Trees had only half the customary luxuriance of foliage; and green grass, instead of covering the country in rank profusion and affording two cuttings in the season, was stinted and could only be cut once. The ground not having been thoroughly soaked, dust is already as deep as it usually lies in March. Rivers and canals are already low and have little forage on their banks. Prices of food and fodder soon began to rise, and a month ago the common people were complaining that unground grain had reached the usual price of flour. In the markets one misses the piles of cheap vegetables on which Hindoos largely subsist. The poor peasantry with despair watched their crops, which had been sown in July, wither when they should have come to seed, and after doing all that could be done by irrigation, they sadly cut them for fodder or turned

their cattle into the fields. In a few weeks more cattle will begin to die, and the people will be selling their implements and the doors and posts and rafters of their huts. It would have been in order for a succession of heavy thunderstorms to come during the month of October, which would have permitted the winter crop to be sown. But that chance has passed, and any rain now will simply raise the water in the rivers and wells, and produce some grass and vegetables. The people are in the depths of despondency.

The Supreme Government and the Provincial Governments are already preparing for the emergency. Revenue is being remitted by the crore of rupees, and relief works, large and small, are being projected to give work to the multitudes who can find no work for themselves. Europeans and natives, on salaries varying from five hundred rupees a month to five rupees, are being drafted from all departments of the public service, to do special famine duty as superintendents, inspectors, engineers, overseers, clerks, accountants and peons. This will leave the departments undermanned at the very time that all regular work is increased and confused by the stress. For during a famine the police are worked off their feet; work in the secretariats is much increased; the Post Office is loaded down with official correspondence, and telegrams fly like swallows, each contradicting or superseding the one before it. Railway trains loaded with grain follow one another like ants, so that I have known a driver fall off his engine from sheer exhaustion. Another was found standing asleep with his hand on the lever, and guards have fallen asleep in their vans. In the awful famine of 1887 a driver, who may have been an Irishman, assured me that for three weeks he had worked "on an average" twenty-four hours a day.

The men drafted off from these departments, being organised under experienced officers, will go expeditiously to work, and before the famine is far advanced multitudes of men and women will be seen building roads, raising the earthwork for railways, digging channels or canals and excavating great "tanks" like lakes, not to mention sinking wells and other small works on which parties of labourers are employed near their own homes. All this work implies the purchase, on short notice, of hundreds of thousands of hoes and pickaxes, thousands of which are stolen, and what becomes of the lot when the famine is over nobody knows. Basket-makers have also to be set to work to make hundreds of thousands of baskets for carrying earth and stones, and the material for so many baskets has to be procured from distant jungles. One might suppose that this was reasonable "famine relief work" for the basket-makers, but it is not. For although the basket-makers may be living on the spot, the baskets must be ordered through contractors, who have ways of compelling the men to make the baskets, but who take a liberal share of the

price. If the basket-makers were dealt with directly, they are so shiftless and perverse that they would not fill a tenth part of the order. Another thing one might suppose is that, as anybody with the use of his hands can learn to make coolies' baskets in a week, the starving peasantry would take to that trade. But anybody who knows India knows that the people will die cheerfully rather than do work to which they are not accustomed. Huts also need to be provided, to shelter the workpeople. These are constructed of straw or leaves, which are not readily procurable after a drought.

Such are specimens of the harassments under which famine relief is carried on. Two more, which are of a high order, may be mentioned. When a new road, many miles in length, has been sanctioned, the question arises whether it shall be constructed by the Department of Public Works or by the district officers, that is, the officers ordinarily employed in the judicial, revenue and general administrative duties of the district, who understand no more about making a road than every person of common intelligence does. If the Department make the road, it will be a good road, the work of skilled engineers, and will be a credit for years. Good wages will be paid to the labourers, but good work will be exacted from them, each day's work being measured and tested. But if the road be constructed under the district officers, the first object in view will be to provide for the labourers, and the work will be slowly done and badly done, and will require to be done over again the next year. Moreover, in spite of the lower wages paid to the labourers, a road made in this way costs more than one made by the Public Works Department. And it has happened that at the end of a famine such a road or tank has been left unfinished, to disappear in the course of a few seasons, because the district officers have reverted to their regular duties, the famine arrangements have been broken up, and no one has been responsible for continuing or keeping up that road.

I have seen not fewer than a dozen great famine relief works carried on by district officers, and the slackness was both pitiful and ridiculous. The baskets had been made of half the regular size, and they were never more than half filled. The native overseers knew that the chief purpose in view was to feed the people, so they let them work or not as they liked, and they themselves came to work late and left early. If it happen that a Department work and a district officer's work are within ten or twenty miles of each other, numbers of the labourers are apt to leave one and go to the other, according as they tire of work or feel a desire for higher wages.

Another great question that distresses the officers responsible for famine relief is how and when to pay the labourers. If they are paid once a week, they spend the money at once, and must be paid over again or starve. If they are paid by the day, natives are so intolerably slow at counting money that most of the night is spent

in paying for the day's work. I once arrived at a famine camp at two o'clock in the morning, and seeing the blaze of torches and hearing the hum of voices in a certain direction I went there and found some two thousand labourers being paid by three men, who were counting out coppers with patient deliberation and always twice over to avoid mistakes.

There can be no question that the people prefer to be paid in money, which they may spend as they please, and part of which they prefer to lay out in cheap condiments. But the difficulties of carrying, storing, guarding, and counting out the vast quantities of copper pice required to pay a famine camp, together with the certainty that the grain-dealers will cheat the workpeople out of much of it, often render it necessary to pay the people in grain. That, again, has the evil result of disturbing the market; for merchants are reluctant to import grain for the emergency till they know what Government is going to do. It is no part of a merchant's policy to import more grain than he can sell at the highest possible price; while Government endeavours, by any means contrivable, to place food within reach of the famine-stricken people at a reasonable price.

One would suppose that nothing was simpler than to buy a few tons of grain and hire honest men on salaries to retail it. But such has been the moulding effect of millenniums of caste that nobody except a grain-dealer by caste knows how to sell grain. It is not that his caste forbids him to do it; but he simply does not know how, any more than a ploughman can be shown how to repair watches. The Governor-General could sit down and sell grain by the measure, but a Hindoo clerk or carpenter could not. His mind and hands are unable to apply themselves to that kind of exercise.

A source of much anxiety where thousands of workpeople are gathered together is the water-supply, for rivers run low and wells dry up, unless they are deep, or are deepened. Another is sanitation, for it would require a slave-driver's lash to make the people conform to the most ordinary and obvious sanitary regulations. There is never a famine without one or more outbreaks of epidemic cholera; and that is the last straw on the back of the distracted and over-worked officers who have charge of the camp. For instantly, without notice, the people, who have been throwing every difficulty in the way of preventive measures, and who will submit to no curative measures, fly by the thousand, anywhere, to perish of want if not of the disease, and to scatter seeds of cholera over the country.

My own opinion is that the Goojerat famine of 1900 would not have been the terrible famine it was had not an outbreak of cholera, which could well be called furious, broken up the ample and well-organised relief arrangements, and carried off thousands of victims. An outbreak of that character is simply appalling. People fall at their work, one after another, as if an invisible enemy were firing

at them with noiseless rifles. In a previous famine I once saw five coolies struck down with their tools in their hands within a quarter of an hour.

As the season advances and the famine grows more severe, it becomes necessary to open kitchens for the gratuitous distribution of food to the thousands of starving people who are too weak to work. This would be quite unnecessary if the people had sense and could see that it was better to anticipate an emergency than to wait for it to overwhelm them. But rather than go away to a relief work as soon as it is opened, tens of thousands linger in idleness on their homesteads till they become paupers. They reduce their daily allowance of food, and eke it out with leaves and seeds which they collect in the woods; they sell their implements of husbandry for a fraction of their value, and their axes and any vessels and cheap personal ornaments they possess, and also the doors and rafters of their huts; and, it must be confessed, many of them take to robbery. The pernicious institution of caste complicates this difficulty. The lowest castes who are attached to the land have less hold on it than the castes just above them; and the money-lenders or grain-dealers, with whom the police are always in sympathy, have less interest in saving them from final ruin. Besides, these castes find difficulty in working comfortably along with their "betters" on the relief works: they are not in social sympathy with them, and by nature and habit they are not such steady workers. So they leave the works, and wander about the country on the chance of subsisting on what they can pick up. They are only half clad even according to the Indian standard, and many of them are scarcely clad at all. If they have children with them, they desert them one by one, leaving them to public charity if they enter a town, and to jackals and wolves if they are in the country. They grow weaker from day to day, taking shorter walks and longer rests till they sink down to rise no more. In the course of three great famines I must have seen thousands of men, women and children in the different stages of this process; and I have grown so accustomed to finding dead bodies that I have ceased to step aside and look at them. The people wander by night as well as by day, and are frequently found dead or dying in the early morning. Now, as I write, I have the appalling prospect before me that, on the sole condition of my living to see it, I shall see all this once more during next March, April, and May. For nothing that love and money can do will prevent a million or more of people from perishing in this way. My comfort is, and it is a strong consolation, that where one dies many will be saved from equally certain death. For be it remembered that in an agricultural country and with an improvident population the failure of two harvests in succession means extinction of the means of national subsistence. Almost all the food of the people during several months has to be brought

into the country. And this is grandly done. I have seen not fewer than fifty relief-centres; and at every one I have been able to turn from the many dead to the very many more living, and the satisfaction has outweighed the pain.

Two of the most distinguished natives of India have unblushingly made and repeated the statement that before the British occupation of this country famines were neither as frequent nor as disastrous as they have been since. Such a statement cannot be made without callousness which is distressing to think of; and it is an evidence of the discernment and magnanimity of the heads of the people that only two responsible men have said this. Native and European eye-witnesses have described the famines of pre-British days with details of horror which would not be true of any famine that I have seen. And we may understand that the accounts are true from what we know about famines in Persia, China and similar countries at the present day. But there is another, wider respect in which the evil of famines has been much mitigated under British rule. Modern famines in India last one year, and next year things are as if the famine had not been. But mention is made in the Mahabharat and in subsequent records as recent as the later Mughal period of famines which continued for five, seven, ten, and even twelve years. That was not because the rains failed year after year, but because the population was gone, and because neither cattle, implements, nor seed was available to start cultivation again. In those days, that is, for untold centuries, a severe famine meant wholesale devastation, and it took years for people to gather again and to find means to cultivate the ground. But such a catastrophe is no longer possible. No sooner does the rain fall after a drought than Government supplies the people with bullocks and seed and all else necessary to resume their occupation.

To take up again my account of food kitchens for the famine-made paupers, the people are gathered in camps to the number of from a few hundreds to two thousand, housed in sheds or huts, fed twice a day on boiled grains, green vegetables and flat cakes like Scottish scones. Milk is also provided for babies and for sick people, and a native doctor is at hand with a stock of medicines. This implies, beside the construction of huts, store-sheds and cooking places, the employment of a superintendent, a doctor, two or three clerks, and a full establishment of cooks, attendants, other servants, peons, guards, messengers and scavengers. These are all natives, and there are a considerable number of them, as there always are of servants in private houses in India, for each servant gets through only a small amount of work in a day. The European oversight, without which the camp could not, in most cases, be carried on, is done by the ordinary officers of the district, with one or two additional men specially appointed, and sometimes a Famine Com-

missioner, who has general oversight of all the famine relief work of a province. All the persons employed about famine relief work are very uncomfortable, but it is not the custom of Englishmen to complain of the circumstances when duty has to be performed. The whole native staff, however, is thoroughly miserable. The men are not accustomed to knock about, or to be put out of their usual course; they dislike being separated from their families; their eating and washing or bathing is beset with difficulties; they have no interest whatever in their work, for the paupers belong to other castes. So they submit to their fate with a bad grace, and long more earnestly for the rains to come than the starving paupers.

From start to finish the conducting of a camp of famine paupers is a tug of war. I can think of no responsibility more depressing. After each of the last three great famines the Government appointed a Commission and published a voluminous Report, and the second and third times I thought that it would have been better to study and act upon the previous Report. Each Report, however, has missed what strikes me as the point most requiring investigation. That is that in every famine, after the first few weeks of general demoralisation, nearly all the mortality takes place at the pauper camps, where there is abundance of food, and that people go on dying there, in dozens every day if the camp be a large one, till the end of the famine. This was what I meant when I said that, notwithstanding all that love and money could do, we must be prepared to see a million or more of people die of starvation next hot season. The reason that each Commission has evaded this outstanding feature is that none of them has been able to suggest a remedy, unless it be more first-class supervision. Although the supervision has hitherto been in the hands of the higher district officers, who are nearly always Europeans, I see no reason for insisting on Europeans. There are natives with education and force of character who could do the work as well as Europeans do it.

The extraordinary and continuous mortality at the pauper camps is attributable to two clearly-defined causes. One of these is the perversity of the paupers themselves. European paupers are neither reasonable nor easily manageable; but they are as different as they can be from paupers in this country. They value life, and many of them have a measure of gratitude. Indian paupers look upon death as, a less evil than discomfort or inconvenience. And discomfort does not mean to them being without clothes, lying on the ground, living on dry crusts, or having nothing to do: it means having to make an exertion, being put out of their usual way, or being deprived of tobacco and spices. They are seldom happier than when they can sit for hours doing nothing. Strangest of all, they do not use violence as a rule. A number of them may be famishing, with plenty of food lying exposed before them; yet one native peon

suffices to keep the crowd off. In accordance with this indifference to life, they will leave the camp and wander away, seemingly out of mere restlessness, and turn up at another camp with a lying story, or come back to the camp they have left in such a state of emaciation that their death within a few days is certain.

Energetic efforts were made in the Madras famine (1876-77) to detain the paupers by force, but in the last two famines only persuasion and threats were resorted to. However, people can laugh at threats who prefer death to restraint and starvation to inconvenience.

The brutality of the perishing people is equal to their perversity. They do not know the feeling of gratitude, although they are profuse in expressions of it when they desire to allay suspicion. They practise deceit with amazing cunning and audacity. They are unaffected by the sight of the highest gentlemen in the land wearing out their lives to save them, or by the sight of lakhs of rupees being lavished for their benefit, or by the sight of dozens of their own countrymen struggling with the impossible task of feeding them. They will not do a hand's turn to relieve these, or to help the hundreds who are famishing and sinking and dying round them. On the contrary, they do everything they can to promote the suffering of the sufferers, and increase the cares of those who are helping them. They break or lose the dishes in which they get their food after every meal. They pollute the precious water-supply. They tear down their sheds and use the materials for fuel. They insolently disobey the simplest sanitary rules with a flagrancy which cannot be described here. If blankets or clothes be given to them, as is sometimes done by the thousand, they go off with them and sell them, live on the money for a day or two, starve for a day or two more, and then come back to the camp in a dying state. More than once—possibly more than a hundred times—a systematic trade in blankets has been found to be going on between the paupers and a dealer in the bazaar who paid a trifle for the blankets as often as they were brought to him, and then sold them again at full price to the camp authorities. The camp servants connive at this trade, and sometimes one of them is himself the dealer.

All this is not the worst that the paupers do. They rob the dying of food and blankets; they throw away food given to them if they see something better given to the sick; mothers snatch away milk which is being given to their infants, or they take away all their children and give them to the jackals unless they are allowed to eat with them and share their special food. Is it a wonder that the servants are provoked to thrash the paupers if they can do so unobserved? Or that two high officers have exclaimed in my hearing, "If the people do not care to live, I say *let them die*"? An old missionary, who is all sympathy and kindness for the natives,

told me, after some months' experience of a relief camp, that he was losing faith in humanity, so much had he seen of inhumanity among the famine-stricken people, whom he had expected to find overwhelmed and melted with gratitude.

The second cause of the incredible mortality at relief camps is the callousness and indifference of the native staff. No one without seeing it for himself could believe how destitute of feeling for the sufferings of people of another caste these men are. In the presence of a European officer, whose visit is always known beforehand, they make a show of interest; but even then they do things, or leave things undone, proving that they have not grasped the idea of their most emphatic orders that every starving person must be fed at once at any hazard. I have seen officers, overcharged with humane feeling, jump about in paroxysms of rage because a dozen new arrivals, emaciated and faint, had been kept without food all day on some trifling pretext. But it was a case of Kipling's white man riling, and brown man smiling; for those he raged at simply concluded that he had been drinking! They were constitutionally incapable of seeing that they were in fault.

Travelling as a private person, I have usually arrived at famine camps before my presence in the district was known, and have seen things as they ordinarily went on. It would require several pages of this REVIEW to tell briefly what I have seen. In a sentence it amounts to this: that the feeding of starving people and the saving of life seemed to be the last thing in the minds of the establishment. I speak not of fraud, but of carelessness and callousness. In the Goojerat famine, seven years ago, I was at a relief camp with the civil surgeon of another district, who was there by chance and had no authority. As a medical man and a Government servant he saw all I saw, but he said nothing, and the staff and servants did not know who he was. The mortality of adults at that camp was from thirty to forty daily, and I saw nineteen bodies burned on one pyre. We went into the hospital shed, where some two hundred men and women were lying, nearly all of whom were to die within seven days. Swarms of flies were crawling over their faces. Some of the poor sufferers raised a hand now and then to drive off the flies: others could only move their heads uneasily: others again, with fixed eyes and open mouths, could do nothing, they were nearly dead. The native doctor of the camp, who was college-trained, as the humblest Government doctors are now, was present, but did not remark the flies. I called his attention to them, on which he explained that two men, whose duty it was to attend on the sick, were absent. There were several servants idling about, but it would not have been etiquette to ask them to do other men's work. As for any of them, or any of the hundreds of idle paupers, volunteering to keep the flies

from tormenting the patients on their death-beds, only a simpleton would imagine such a thing.

The civil surgeon and I went into another shed where some forty small children, all big enough to toddle, were getting milk, or milk and water. The children were pressing forward with cocoanut shells, into or over which a man with a large jug was splashing a portion of the liquid as fast as he could, not caring where it fell. There was a good deal of jostling, and some of the children were so small that they could not hold their shells straight or steady. Some got more milk and some less, and a good deal was spilt. One little thing would try to drink its portion at once in the crowd: another, of a different disposition, would hold its shell carefully in both hands and retire to a corner to sip the milk slowly. A morsel of a girl, carrying a smaller morsel of a baby, would hold her shell of milk to the baby's lips. Nobody cared a straw. Before all the children were served, the milk came to an end. The man said, "There is no more; go;" and hurried away. The children who got none were the weakest and least forward. The civil surgeon said to me: "It is 'awful! This is the survival of the fittest.'"

The men primarily to blame for all this mismanagement, which is varied in many ways, are the native superintendents. Some superintendents are men of energy and capacity, under whom the work goes well and the mortality is small. But such men are most difficult to find, and they are made more rare by the requirement that they shall be able to read and write English; for Government can do nothing without accounts and registers. Now I would try to stay the fearful mortality at the pauper camps by selecting for superintendents men with the sole qualification of ruling and managing, and I would let them understand that they might employ what help they required and might do whatever they pleased, provided only that they saved life. They would be under temptation to make a good show by concealing deaths, and by preventing the admission of paupers likely to die, both which things can be easily done with a native establishment. But to thwart such plans is not more difficult than many problems of a famine relief camp. Men of the stamp I have in mind are to be found among the domestic servants of European gentlemen, many of whom possess vast ability for men of their class, and are accustomed to adapt themselves and meet emergencies of many kinds. There are also "village Hampdens" in the villages, possessed of the same kind of ascendancy. All these men are unable to read and write; as were Runjut Singh, Hyder Ali, and Seevajee. They are also boors by comparison with the clerks and doctors over whom they would have authority, but so were Napoleon's marshals. They are clever, and make a great deal of money out of their European masters, so they would need to be quite handsomely paid for uneducated men; to do which requires more

imagination than the Government of India possess. But I am persuaded that they could do the work, and there seems to be no other course for having a famine without heavy continuous mortality where there ought to be none.

A great deal is thought and made of pensioned native officers and non-commissioned officers of the army, who are grand men as far as character and the habit of command go. They are sought after for positions of responsibility. But they can do little except obey orders and give orders. Whereas a good gentleman's butler or "bearer" (body servant) can do anything. He is often a cleverer man than his master, and can get him out of every kind of difficulty except a departmental scrape or a social indiscretion. He is also skilled in ruling establishments of servants, controlling bands of coolies, and manipulating odds and ends of undesirables.

BENJAMIN AITKEN.

REVOLUTION.

"The present is enough for common souls,
Who, never looking forward, are indeed
Mere clay, wherein the footprints of their age
Are petrified for ever."

I RECEIVED a letter the other day. It was from a man in Arizona. It began, "Dear Comrade." It ended, "Yours for the Revolution." I replied to the letter, and my letter began, "Dear Comrade." It ended, "Yours for the Revolution." In the United States there are over 400,000 men, of men and women nearly 1,000,000, who begin their letters "Dear Comrade," and end them, "Yours for the Revolution." In Germany there are 3,000,000 men who begin their letters "Dear Comrade," and end them, "Yours for the Revolution"; in France, 1,000,000 men; in Austria, 800,000 men; in Russia, 400,000 men; in Belgium, 300,000 men; in Italy, 250,000 men; in England, 100,000 men; in Switzerland, 100,000 men; in Denmark, 35,000 men; in Sweden, 50,000 men; in Holland, 40,000 men; in Spain, 30,000 men, comrades, all, and revolutionists.

These are numbers which dwarf the grand armies of Napoleon and Xerxes. But they are numbers, not of conquest and maintenance of the established order, but of conquest and revolution. They compose, when the roll is called, an army of 7,000,000 men, who, in accordance with the conditions of to-day, are fighting with all their might for the conquest of the wealth of the world and for the complete overthrow of existing society.

There has never been anything like this revolution in the history of the world. There is nothing analogous between it and the American Revolution or the French Revolution. It is unique, colossal. Other revolutions compare with it as asteroids compare with the sun. It is alone of its kind, the first world-revolution in a world whose history is replete with revolutions. And not only this, for it is the first organised movement of men to become a world-movement, limited only by the limits of the planet.

This revolution is unlike all other revolutions in many respects. It

is not sporadic. It is not a flame of popular discontent, arising in a day and dying down in a day. It is older than the present generation. It has a history and traditions, and a martyr-roll only less extensive possibly than the martyr-roll of Christianity. It has also a literature a myriad times more imposing, scientific and scholarly than the literature of any previous revolution.

They call themselves "comrades," these men, comrades in the Socialist revolution. Nor is the word empty and meaningless, coined of mere lip service. It knits men together as brothers, as men should be knit together who stand shoulder to shoulder under the red banner of revolt. This red banner, by the way, symbolises the brotherhood of man, and does not symbolise the incendiarism that instantly connects itself with the red banner in the affrighted bourgeois mind. The comradeship of the revolutionists is alive and warm. It passes over geographical lines, transcends race prejudice, and has even proved itself mightier than the Fourth-of-July, spread-eagle Americanism of our forefathers. The French Socialist working-men and the German Socialist working-men forget Alsace and Lorraine, and, when war threatens, pass resolutions declaring that as working-men and comrades they have no quarrel with each other. Only the other day, when Japan and Russia sprang at each other's throats, the revolutionists of Japan addressed the following message to the revolutionists of Russia: "Dear comrades,—Your Government and "ours have recently plunged into war to carry out their Imperialistic "tendencies, but for us Socialists there are no boundaries, race, country, "or nationality. We are comrades, brothers and sisters, and have no "reason to fight. Your enemies are not the Japanese people, but our "militarism and so-called patriotism. Patriotism and militarism are "our mutual enemies."

In January, 1905, throughout the United States the Socialists held mass meetings to express their sympathy for their struggling comrades, the revolutionists of Russia, and, more to the point, to furnish the sinews of war by collecting money and cabling it to the Russian leaders.

The fact of this call for money, and the ready response, and the very wording of the call, make a striking and practical demonstration of the international solidarity of this world revolution. "Whatever "may be the immediate results of the present revolt in Russia, the "Socialist propaganda in that country has received from it an impetus "unparalleled in the history of modern class wars. The heroic battle "for freedom is being fought almost exclusively by the Russian "working class under the intellectual leadership of Russian Socialists, "thus once more demonstrating the fact that the class conscious "working-men have become the vanguard of all liberating movement "of modern times."

Here are 7,000,000 comrades in an organised, international, world-

wide revolutionary movement. Here is a tremendous human force. It must be reckoned with. Here is power. And here is romance—romance so colossal as to be quite beyond the ken of ordinary mortals. These revolutionists are swayed by great passion. They have a keen sense of personal right, much of reverence for humanity, but little reverence, if any at all, for the rule of the dead. They refuse to be ruled by the dead. To the bourgeois mind, their unbelief in the dominant conventions of the established order is startling. They laugh to scorn the sweet ideals and dear moralities of bourgeois society. They intend to destroy bourgeois society with most of its sweet ideals and dear moralities, and chiefest among these are those that group themselves under such heads as private ownership of capital, survival of the fittest, and patriotism—even patriotism.

Such an army of revolution, 7,000,000 strong, is a thing to make rulers and ruling classes pause and consider. The cry of this army is, "No quarter! We want all that you possess. We will be content with nothing less than all that you possess. We want in our hands the reins of power and the destiny of mankind. Here are our hands. They are strong hands. We are going to take your Governments, your palaces, and all your purpled ease away from you, and in that day you shall work for your bread even as the peasant in the field or the starved and rusty clerk in your metropolises. Here are our hands. They are strong hands."

Well may rulers and ruling classes pause and consider. This is revolution. And further, these 7,000,000 men are not an army on paper. Their fighting strength in the field is 7,000,000. To-day they cast 7,000,000 votes in the civilised countries of the world. Yesterday they were not so strong. To-morrow they will be still stronger. And they are fighters. They love peace. They are unafraid of war. They intend nothing less than to destroy existing society and to take possession of the whole world. If the law of the land permits, they fight for this end peaceably, at the ballot-box. If the law of the land does not permit their peaceable destruction of society, and if they have force meted out to them, they resort to force themselves. They meet violence with violence. Their hands are strong, and they are unafraid. In Russia, for instance, there is no suffrage. The Government executes the revolutionists. The revolutionists kill the officers of the Government. The revolutionists meet legal murder with assassination.

Now here arises a particularly significant phase which it would be well for the rulers to consider. Let me make it concrete. I am a revolutionist. Yet I am a fairly sane and normal individual. I speak, and I *think*, of those assassins in Russia as "my comrades." So do all the comrades in America, and all the 7,000,000 comrades in the world. Of what worth an organised international revolutionary movement, if our comrades are not backed up the world over. The

worth is shown by the fact that we do back up the assassinations by our comrades in Russia. They are not disciples of Tolstoy. Nor are we. We are revolutionists.

Our comrades in Russia have formed what they call "The Fighting Organisation." This Fighting Organisation accused, tried, found guilty, and condemned to death, one Sipiagin, Minister of Interior. On April 2nd he was shot and killed in the Maryinsky Palace. Two years later the Fighting Organisation condemned to death and executed another Minister of Interior, Von Plehve. Having done so, it issued a document, dated July 29th, 1904, setting forth the counts of its indictment of Von Plehve and its responsibility for the assassination. Now, and to the point, this document was sent out to the Socialists of the world, and by them was published everywhere in their magazines and newspapers. The point is, not that the Socialists of the world were unafraid to do it, not that they dared to do it, but that they did it as a matter of routine, giving publication to what may be called an official document of the international revolutionary movement.

These are high-lights upon the revolution—granted, but they are also facts. And they are given to the rulers and the ruling classes, not in bravado, not to frighten them, but for them to consider more deeply the spirit and nature of this world-revolution. The time has come for the revolution to demand consideration. It has fastened upon every civilised country in the world. As fast as a country becomes civilised, the revolution fastens upon it. With the introduction of the machine into Japan, Socialism was introduced. Socialism marched into the Philippines shoulder to shoulder with the American soldiers. The echoes of the last gun had scarcely died away when Socialist leagues were forming in Cuba and Porto Rico. Vastly more significant is the fact that of all the countries the revolution has fastened upon, on not one has it relaxed its grip. On the contrary, on every country its grip closes tighter year by year. As an active movement it began obscurely over a generation ago. In 1867 its voting strength in the world was 30,000. By 1871 its vote had increased to 100,000. Not till 1884 did it pass the half-million point. By 1889 it had passed the million point. It had then gained momentum. In 1892 the Socialist vote of the world was 1,798,391; in 1893, 2,585,898; in 1895, 3,033,718; in 1898, 4,515,591; in 1902, 5,253,054; in 1903, 6,285,374; and in the year of our Lord, 1905, it passed the seven million mark.

Nor has this flame of revolution left the United States untouched. In 1888 there were only 2,068 Socialist votes. In 1902 there were 127,713 Socialist votes. And in 1904, 435,040 Socialist votes were cast. What fanned this flame? Not hard times. The first four years of the twentieth century were considered prosperous years, yet in that time more than 300,000 men added themselves to the ranks

of the revolutionists, flinging their defiance in the teeth of bourgeois society and taking their stand under the blood-red banner. In the State of the writer, California, one man in ten is an avowed and registered revolutionist.

One thing must be clearly understood. This is no spontaneous and vague uprising of a large mass of discontented and miserable people—a blind and instinctive recoil from hurt. On the contrary, the propaganda is intellectual; the movement is based upon economic necessity and is in line with social evolution; while the miserable people have not yet revolted. The revolutionist is no starved and diseased slave in the shambles at the bottom of the social pit, but is, in the main, a hearty, well-fed working-man who sees the shambles waiting for him and his children and declines to descend. The very miserable people are too helpless to help themselves. But they are being helped, and the day is not far distant when their numbers will go to swell the ranks of the revolutionists.

Another thing must be clearly understood. In spite of the fact that middle-class men and professional men are interested in the movement, it is nevertheless a distinctly working-class revolt. The world over, it is a working-class revolt. The workers of the world, as a class, are fighting the capitalists of the world, as a class. The so-called great middle class is a growing anomaly in the social struggle. It is a perishing class (wily statisticians to the contrary), and its historic mission of buffer between the capitalist and working classes has just about been fulfilled. Little remains for it but to wail as it passes into oblivion, as it has already begun to wail in accents Populistic and Jeffersonian-Democratic. The fight is on. The revolution is here, now, and it is the world's workers that are in revolt.

Naturally the question arises: Why is this so? No mere whim of the spirit can give rise to a world revolution. Whim does not conduce to unanimity. There must be a deep-seated cause to make 7,000,000 men of the one mind, to make them cast off allegiance to the bourgeois gods and lose faith in so fine a thing as patriotism. There are many counts of the indictment which the revolutionists bring against the capitalist class, but for present need only one may be stated, and it is a count to which capital has never replied and can never reply.

The capitalist class has managed society, and its management has failed. And not only has it failed in its management, but it has failed deplorably, ignobly, horribly. The capitalist class had an opportunity such as was vouchsafed no previous ruling class in the history of the world. It broke away from the rule of the old feudal aristocracy and made modern society. It mastered matter, organised the machinery of life, and made possible a wonderful era for mankind, wherein no creature should cry aloud because it had not enough to

eat, and wherein for every child there would be opportunity for education, for intellectual and spiritual uplift. Matter being mastered, and the machinery of life organised, all this was possible. Here was the chance, God-given, and the capitalist class failed. It was blind and greedy. It prattled sweet ideals and dear moralities, rubbed its eyes not once, nor ceased one whit in its greediness, and smashed down in a failure as tremendous only as was the opportunity it had ignored.

But all this is like so much cobwebs to the bourgeois mind. As it was blind in the past, it is blind now and cannot see nor understand. Well, then, let the indictment be stated more definitely, in terms sharp and unmistakable. In the first place, consider the cave-man. He was a very simple creature. His head slanted back like an orang-outang's and he had but little more intelligence. He lived in a hostile environment, the prey of all manner of fierce life. He had no inventions nor artifices. His natural efficiency for food-getting was, say, 1. He did not even till the soil. With his natural efficiency of 1, he fought off his carnivorous enemies and got himself food and shelter. He must have done all this, else he would not have multiplied and spread over the earth and sent his progeny down, generation by generation, to become even you and me.

The cave-man, with his natural efficiency of 1, got enough to eat most of the time, and no cave-man ever went hungry all the time. Also, he lived a healthy, open-air life, loafed and rested himself, and found plenty of time in which to exercise his imagination and invent gods. That is to say, he did not have to work all his waking moments in order to get enough to eat. The child of the cave-man (and this is true of the children of all savage peoples) had a childhood, and by that is meant a happy childhood of play and development.

And now, how fares modern man? Consider the United States, the most prosperous and most enlightened country in the world. In the United States there are 10,000,000 people living in poverty. By poverty is meant that condition in life in which, through lack of food and adequate shelter, the mere standard of working efficiency cannot be maintained. In the United States there are 10,000,000 people who have not enough to eat. In the United States, because they have not enough to eat, there are 10,000,000 people who cannot keep the ordinary measure of strength in their bodies. This means that these 10,000,000 people are perishing, are dying, body and soul, slowly, because they have not enough to eat. All over this broad, prosperous, enlightened land, are men, women and children who are living miserably. In all the great cities, where they are segregated in slum-ghettos by hundreds of thousands and by millions, their misery becomes beastliness. No cave-man ever starved as chronically as they starve, ever slept as vilely as they sleep, ever festered with

rottenness and disease as they fester, nor ever toiled as hard and for as long hours as they toil.

In Chicago there is a woman who toiled sixty hours per week. She was a garment worker. She sewed buttons on clothes. Among the Italian garment workers of Chicago, the average weekly wage of the dressmakers is 90 cents, but they work every week in the year. The average weekly wage of the pants-finishers is \$1 31 cents, and the average number of weeks employed in the year is 27.85. The average yearly earnings of the dressmakers are \$37, of the pants-finishers \$42 41 cents. Such wages mean no childhood for the children, beastliness of living, and starvation for all.

Unlike the cave-man, modern man cannot get food and shelter by working for it. Modern man has first to find the work, and in this he is often unsuccessful. Then misery becomes acute. This acute misery is chronicled daily in the newspapers. Let several of the countless instances be cited.

• In New York City lived a woman, Mary Mead. She had three children: Mary, one year old; Johanna, two years old; Alice, four years old. Her husband could find no work. They starved. They were evicted from their shelter at 160, Steuben Street. Mary Mead strangled her baby, Mary, one year old, strangled Alice, four years old, failed to strangle Johanna, two years old, and then herself took poison. Said the father to the police: "Constant poverty has driven my wife insane. We lived at No. 160, Steuben Street, until a week ago, when we were dispossessed. I could get no work. I could not even make enough to put food into our mouths. The babies grew ill and weak. My wife cried nearly all the time."

"So overwhelmed is the Department of Charities with tens of thousands of applications from men out of work that it finds itself unable to cope with the situation."—*New York Commercial*, January 11th, 1905.

In a daily paper, because he cannot get work in order to get something to eat, modern man advertises as follows:—

• "Young man, good education, unable to obtain employment, will sell to physician and bacteriologist for experimental purposes all right and title to his body. Address for price, Box 3466, *Examiner*."

"Frank A. Mallin went to the central police station Wednesday night and asked to be locked up on a charge of vagrancy. He said he had been conducting an unsuccessful search for work for so long that he was sure he must be a vagrant. In any event, he was so hungry he must be fed. Police Judge Graham sentenced him to 'ninety days' imprisonment."—*San Francisco Examiner*.

In a room at the Soto House, 32, Fourth Street, San Francisco, was found the body of W. G. Robbins. He had turned on the gas. Also was found his diary, from which the following extracts are made:—

"March 3rd.—No chance of getting anything here. What will I do?

"March 7th.—Cannot find anything yet.

"March 8th.—Am living on doughnuts at five cents a day.

"March 9th.—My last quarter gone for room rent.

"March 10th.—God help me! Have only 5 cents left. Can get "nothing to do. What next? Starvation or ——? I have spent "my last nickel to-night. What shall I do? Shall it be steal, beg, "or die? I have never stolen, begged, or starved in all my fifty "years of life, but now I am on the brink—death seems the only "refuge.

"March 11th.—Sick all day—burning fever this afternoon. Had "nothing to eat to-day or since yesterday noon. My head, my head. "Good-bye all."

How fares the child of modern man in this most prosperous of lands? In the city of New York 50,000 children go hungry to school every morning. From the same city on January 12th, a Press dispatch was sent out over the country of a case reported by Dr. A. E. Daniel, of the New York Infirmary for Women and Children. The case was that of a babe, eighteen months old, who earned by its labour 50 cents. per week in a tenement sweat shop.

So fares modern man and the child of modern man in the United States, most prosperous and enlightened of all countries on earth. It must be remembered that the instances given are instances only, but that they can be multiplied myriads of times. It must also be remembered that what is true of the United States is true of all the civilised world. Such misery was not true of the cave-man. Then what has happened? Has the hostile environment of the cave-man grown more hostile for his descendants? Has the cave-man's natural efficiency of 1 for food-getting and shelter-getting diminished in modern man to $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$?

On the contrary, the hostile environment of the cave-man has been destroyed. For modern man it no longer exists. All carnivorous enemies, the daily menace of the younger world, have been killed off. Many of the species of prey have become extinct. Here they are far from being a menace to mankind. Modern man, when he wants recreation and change, goes to those secluded portions of the world for a hunt. Also, in idle moments, he wails regretfully at the passing of the "big game," which he knows, in the not distant future will disappear from the earth.

Nor since the day of the cave-man has man's efficiency for food-getting and shelter-getting diminished. It has increased a thousand-fold. Since the day of the cave-man matter has been mastered. The secrets of matter have been discovered. Its laws have been formulated. Wonderful artifices have been made, and marvellous inventions, all tending to increase tremendously man's natural efficiency of 1 in

every food-getting, shelter-getting exertion, in farming, mining, manufacturing, transportation and communication.

From the cave-man to the hand-workers of three generations ago the increase in efficiency for food-and-shelter-getting has been very great. But in this day, by machinery, the efficiency of the hand-worker of three generations ago has in turn been increased many times. Formerly it required 200 hours of human labour to place 100 tons of ore on railroad cars. To-day, aided by machinery, but two hours of human labour are required to do the same task. The United States Bureau of Labour is responsible for the following table, showing the comparatively recent increase in man's food-and-shelter-getting efficiency:—

	Machine hours.	Hand hours.
Barley (100 bushels)	9	211
Corn (50 bushels shelled, stalks, husks and blades cut into fodder)	34	228
Oats (160 bushels)	28	265
Wheat (50 bushels)	7	160
Loading ore (loading 100 tons iron ore on cars)	2	200
Unloading coal (transferring 200 tons from canal boats to bins 400 feet distant)	20	240
Pitchforks (50 pitchforks, 12 inch tines)	3	118
Plough (one land slide plough, oak beams and handles)	3	118

According to the same authority, under the best conditions for organisation in farming, labour can produce 20 bushels of wheat for 66 cents, or 1 bushel for $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents. This was done on a bonanza farm of 10,000 acres in California, and was the average cost of the whole product of the farm. Mr. Carrol D. Wright says that to-day 4,500,000 men, aided by machinery, turn out a product that would require the labour of 40,000,000 men if produced by hand. Professor Herzeg, of Austria, says that 5,000,000 people, with the machinery of to-day, employed at socially useful labour, would be able to supply a population of 20,000,000 people with all the necessities and small luxuries of life by working $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours per day.

This being so, matter being mastered, man's efficiency for food-and-shelter-getting being increased a thousand-fold over the efficiency of the cave-man, then why is it that millions of modern men live more miserably than lived the cave-man? This is the question the revolutionist asks, and he asks it of the managing class, the capitalist class. The capitalist class does not answer it. The capitalist class cannot answer it.

If modern man's food-and-shelter-getting efficiency is a thousand-

fold greater than that of the cave-man, why, then, are there 10,000,000 people in the United States to-day who are not properly sheltered and properly fed? If the child of the cave-man did not have to work, why, then, to-day, in the United States are 80,000 children working out their lives in the textile factories alone? If the child of the cave-man did not have to work, why, then, to-day, in the United States, are there 1,752,197 child labourers?

It is a true count in the indictment. The capitalist class has mismanaged, is to-day mismanaging. In New York City 50,000 children go hungry to school, and in New York City there are 1,320 millionaires. The point, however, is not that the mass of mankind is miserable because of the wealth the capitalist class has taken to itself. Far from it. The point really is that the mass of mankind is miserable, not for want of the wealth taken by the capitalist class, but for want of the wealth that was never created. This wealth was never created because the capitalist class managed too wastefully and irrationally. The capitalist class, blind and greedy, grasping madly, has not only not made the best of its management, but made the worst of it. It is a management prodigiously wasteful. This point cannot be emphasised too strongly.

In face of the facts that modern man lives more wretchedly than the cave-man, and that modern man's food-and-shelter-getting efficiency is a thousand-fold greater than the cave-man's, no other solution is possible than that the management is prodigiously wasteful.

With the natural resources of the world, the machinery already invented, a rational organisation of production and distribution, and an equally rational elimination of waste, the able-bodied workers would not have to labour more than two or three hours per day to feed everybody, clothe everybody, house everybody, educate everybody, and give a fair measure of little luxuries to everybody. There would be no more material want and wretchedness, no more children toiling out their lives, no more men and women and babes living like beasts and dying like beasts. Not only would matter be mastered, but the machine would be mastered. In such a day incentive would be finer and nobler than the incentive of to-day, which is the incentive of the stomach. No man, woman, nor child would be impelled to action by an empty stomach. On the contrary, they would be impelled to action as a child in a spelling match is impelled to action, as boys and girls at games, as scientists formulating law, as inventors applying law, and artists and sculptors painting canvases and shaping clay, as poets and statesmen serving humanity by singing and by state-craft. The spiritual, intellectual and artistic uplift consequent upon such a condition of society would be tremendous. All the human world would surge upward in a mighty wave.

This was the opportunity vouchsafed the capitalist class. Less blindness on its part, less greediness and a rational management were all that was necessary. A wonderful era was possible for the human race. But the capitalist class failed. It made a shambles of civilisation. Nor can the capitalist class plead not guilty. It knew of the opportunity. Its wise men told it of the opportunity, its scholars and its scientists told it of the opportunity. All that they said is there to-day in the books, just so much damning evidence against it. It would not listen. It was too greedy. It rose up (as it rises up to-day), shamelessly, in our legislative halls, and declared that profits were impossible without the toil of children and babes. It lulled its conscience to sleep with prattle of sweet ideals and dear moralities, and allowed the suffering and misery of mankind to continue and to increase. In short, the capitalist class failed to take advantage of the opportunity.

But the opportunity is still here. The capitalist class has been tried and found wanting. Remains the working class to see what it can do with the opportunity. "But the working class is incapable," says the capitalist class. "What do you know about it?" the working class replies. "Because you have failed is no reason that we shall fail. Furthermore, we are going to have a try at it anyway. Seven millions of us say so. And what have you to say to that?"

And what can the capitalist class say? Grant the incapacity of the working class. Grant that the indictment and the argument of the revolutionists are all wrong. The 7,000,000 revolutionists remain. Their existence is a fact. Their belief in their capacity, and in their indictment and their argument is a fact. Their constant growth is a fact. Their intention to destroy present-day society is a fact, as is also their intention to take possession of the world with all its wealth and machinery and Governments. Moreover, it is a fact that the working class is vastly larger than the capitalist class.

The revolution is a revolution of the working class. How can the capitalist class, in the minority, stem this tide of revolution? What has it to offer? What does it offer? Employers' Associations, injunctions, civil suits for plundering the treasuries of the Labour Unions, clamour and combination for the open shop, bitter and shameless opposition to the eight-hour day, strong efforts to defeat all reform child-labour Bills, graft in every municipal council, strong lobbies and bribery in every legislature for the purchase of capitalist legislation, bayonets, machine guns, policeman's clubs, professional strike breakers, and armed Pinkertons—these are the things the capitalist class is dumping in front of the tide of revolution, as though, forsooth, to hold it back.

The capitalist class is as blind to-day to the menace of the revolution as it was blind in the past to its God-given opportunity.

It cannot see how precarious is its position, cannot comprehend the power and the portent of the revolution. It goes on its placid way, prattling sweet ideals and dear moralities and scrambling sordidly for material benefits.

No overthrown ruler or class in the past ever considered the revolution that overthrew it, and so with the capitalist class of to-day. Instead of compromising, instead of lengthening its lease of life by conciliation and by a removal of some of the harsher oppressions of the working class, it antagonises the working class, drives the working class into revolution. Every broken strike in recent years, every legally plundered trade union treasury, every closed shop made into an open shop, has driven the members of the working class directly hurt over to Socialism by hundreds and thousands. Show a working-man that his union fails, and he becomes a revolutionist. Break a strike with an injunction or bankrupt a union with a civil suit, and the working-men hurt thereby listen to the siren song of the Socialist and are lost for ever to the political capitalist parties.

Antagonism never lulled revolution, and antagonism is about all the capitalist class offers. It is true it offers some few antiquated notions which were very efficacious in the past, but which are no longer efficacious. Fourth-of-July liberty in terms of the Declaration of Independence and of the French Encyclopædists is scarcely apposite to-day. It does not appeal to the working-man who has had his head broken by a policeman's club, his union treasury bankrupted by a court decision, or his job taken away from him by a labour-saving invention. Nor does the Constitution of the United States appear so glorious and constitutional to the working-man who has experienced a bull-pen or been unconstitutionally deported from Colorado. Nor are this particular working-man's hurt feelings soothed by reading in the newspapers that both the bull-pen and the deportation were pre-eminently just, legal, and constitutional. "To hell, then, with the 'constitution!'" says he, and another revolutionist has been made—by the capitalist class.

In short, so blind is the capitalist class that it does nothing to lengthen its lease of life, while it does everything to shorten it. The capitalist class offers nothing that is clean, noble, and alive. The revolutionists offer everything that is clean, noble, and alive. They offer service, unselfishness, sacrifice, martyrdom—the things that sting awake the imagination of the people, touching their hearts with the fervour that arises out of the impulse toward good and which is essentially religious in its nature.

But the revolutionists blow hot and blow cold. They offer facts and statistics, economics and scientific arguments. If the working-man be merely selfish, the revolutionists show him, mathematically demonstrate to him, that his welfare will be bettered by the revolution.

If the working-man be the higher type, moved by impulses toward right conduct, if he have soul and spirit, the revolutionists offer him the things of the soul and the spirit—the tremendous things that cannot be measured by dollars and cents, nor be held down by dollars and cents. The revolutionist cries out upon wrong and injustice, and preaches righteousness. And, most potent of all, he sings the eternal song of human freedom—a song of all lands and all tongues and all time.

Few members of the capitalist class see the revolution. Most of them are too ignorant, and many are too afraid to see it. It is the same old story of every perishing ruling class in the world's history. Fat with power and possession, drunken with success, and made soft and mushy by surfeit and by cessation of struggle, they are like the drones clustered about the honey-vats when the worker-bees spring upon them to end their rotund existence.

President Roosevelt vaguely sees the revolution, is frightened by it, and recoils from seeing it. As he says: "Above all, we need to 'remember that any kind of class animosity in the political world is, 'if possible, even more wicked, even more destructive to national 'welfare, than sectional, race, or religious animosity.'"

Class animosity in the political world, President Roosevelt maintains, is wicked. But class animosity in the political world is the preachment of the revolutionists. "Let the class wars in the 'industrial world continue," they said, "but extend the class wars to 'the political world." As their leader, Eugene V. Debe, says: "So 'far as this struggle is concerned, there is no good capitalist and no 'bad working-man. Every capitalist is your enemy and every • "working man is your friend."

Here is class animosity in the political world with a vengeance. And here is revolution. In 1888 there were only 2,000 revolutionists of this type in the United States. In 1900 there were 127,000 revolutionists; in 1904, 435,000 revolutionists. Wickedness of the President Roosevelt definition evidently flourishes and increases in the United States. Quite so, for it is the revolution that flourishes and increases.

Here and there a member of the capitalist class catches a clear glimpse of the revolution and raises a warning cry. But his class does not heed. President Eliot of Harvard raised such a cry: "I am 'forced to believe there is a present danger of Socialism never before 'so imminent in America in so dangerous a form, because never before 'imminent in so well organised a form. The danger lies in the 'obtaining control of the trades unions by the Socialists." And the capitalist employers, instead of giving heed to the warning, are perfecting their strike-breaking organisation and combining more strongly than ever for a general assault upon that dearest of all

things to the trades unions, the closed shop. In so far as this assault succeeds, by just that much will the capitalist class shorten its lease of life. It is the old, old story over again, and over again. The drunken drones still cluster greedily about the honey-vats.

Possibly one of the most amusing spectacles of to-day is the attitude of the American Press towards the revolution. It is also a pathetic spectacle. It compels the onlooker to be aware of a distinct loss of pride in his species. Dogmatic utterance from the mouth of ignorance may make gods laugh, but it should make men weep. And the American editors (in the general instance) are so impressive about it. The old "divide-up" "men-are-*not*-born-free-and-equal" propositions are enunciated gravely and sagely, as things white-hot and new from the forge of human wisdom. Their feeble vapourings show no more than a school-boy's comprehension of the nature of the revolution. Parasites themselves on the capitalist class, serving the capitalist class by moulding public opinion, they, too, cluster drunkenly about the honey-vats.

Of course, this is true only of the large majority of American editors. To say that it is true of all of them would be to cast too great obloquy upon the human race. Also, it would be untrue, for here and there an occasional editor does see clearly—and in his case, ruled by stomach-incentive, is usually afraid to say what he thinks about it. So far as the science and the sociology of the revolution are concerned, the average editor is a generation or so behind the facts. He is intellectually slothful, accepts no facts until they are accepted by the majority, and prides himself upon his conservatism. He is an instinctive optimist, prone to believe that what ought to be, is. The revolutionist gave this up long ago, and believes not that what ought to be, is, but what is, is, and that it may not be what it ought to be at all.

Now and then, rubbing his eyes vigorously, an editor catches a sudden glimpse of the revolution and breaks out in naive volubility, as, for instance, the one who wrote the following in the *Chicago Chronicle*: "American Socialists are revolutionists. They know that 'they are revolutionists. It is high time that other people should 'appreciate the fact.' A white-hot, brand-new discovery, and he proceeded to shout it out from the house-top, that we, forsooth, were revolutionists. Why, it was just what we have been doing all these years—shouting it from the house-tops that we are revolutionists, and stop us who can.

The time should be past for the mental attitude: "Revolution is atrocious. Sir, there is no revolution." Likewise should the time be past for that other familiar attitude: "Socialism is slavery. Sir, 'it will never be.'" It is no longer a question of dialectics, theories, and dreams. There is no question about it. The revolution is a fact.

It is here, now. Seven million revolutionists, organised, working day and night, are preaching the revolution—that passionate gospel, the brotherhood of man. Not only is it a cold-blooded economic propaganda, but it is in essence a religious propaganda with a fervour in it of Paul and Christ. The capitalist class has been indicted. It has failed in its management, and its management is to be taken away from it. Seven million men of the working class say that they are going to get the rest of the working class to join with them and take the management away. The revolution is here, now. Stop it who can.

JACK LONDON.

THE RELIGIONS OF GREECE AND ROME.

WITHIN the last thirty years Classical research has been profoundly influenced by its alliance with kindred scientific studies. As a result of the consequent change in method, our ideas have been not only corrected and enlarged but in many cases revolutionised. Whole antecedent civilisations have come to light on sites of subsequent Greek and Roman occupation. The manners, customs, and consecutive histories of these prehistoric peoples have been sifted and chronologically arranged. Legends, which past scholars ranked with nursery tales and discredited accordingly, have risen to a position of first-rate value as historical testimony owing to their frequent and unexpected confirmation by the discoveries of archaeology. The increase in our knowledge of art and mythology has been so enormous that the study of these subjects is regarded as a modern addition to the domain of Classics.

The extreme importance of these recent discoveries as affecting our knowledge of the Classics in general should teach us the imperative necessity of keeping an open mind, and of allowing habit to interfere as little as need be with our readiness to listen to new testimony.

In view of the immense advance we have made in other branches of Classical enquiry, it is perhaps surprising that we have achieved so little positive progress in our study of the religions of Greece and Rome considered in their relation to one another. In this respect, our chief debt to the critical and scientific spirit of modern times is that it has partially freed us from certain traditional misconceptions.

Less than a century ago the religions of Greece and Rome were popularly regarded as identical in their main essentials. It was assumed that the gods of the two nations were the same, with a difference merely of name. The reason for this widespread error can readily be explained by referring to the history of Classical scholarship. Native Roman religion had produced neither legend nor mythology. It was wholly lacking in imagination, and was therefore incapable of supplying subject-matter fit for literary

treatment. For this reason Roman writers—in particular the poets of the Augustan age, when the fashion of “Hellenism” prevailed most extensively—drew freely upon the products of Greek imagination and fancy to supplement a national defect. In the service of literature they utilised to the utmost the influence which Greek ideas had already exerted on Roman religion, even to the extent of representing the greater part of Greek mythology and legend in a Roman dress. In the early centuries of the present era, the antipathy of the Christian teachers to Greek literature with its pagan associations was the chief among several causes which for some thousand years extinguished the study of Greek learning in Western Europe. But for the service of Byzantine scholars in preserving its study in the schools of Athens, Asia Minor, and Alexandria, our knowledge of Greek language and literature could never have been recovered. The study of Roman authors, on the other hand, was never interrupted. During the whole of the Byzantine period and early middle ages Latin continued to be the only medium of literary expression in Western Europe. Although the tendency of Christian teaching was to discourage an intimate acquaintance with the majority of Roman writers, the leisure of the monks induced them to preserve and multiply the manuscripts of old authors, and to study them with a view to perfecting their knowledge of Latin. At the same time, the immense popularity which the writings of Vergil had always experienced was greatly assisted by an allegorical explanation of the *Æneid* as the triumph of wisdom and virtue over folly and passion, and by a prophetic interpretation of the fourth eclogue as a reference to the coming of Christ. Thus, when Greek literature was at length restored to England by the revival of learning, its religious teaching was found merely to corroborate that of the Roman writers, with which scholars had always been familiar. The translations of Pope confirmed and perpetuated the heresy; and men continued to think and speak of “the ancients” as a homogeneous body. An age of scholars completely devoid of the historical sense not unnaturally accepted the identification of the two pantheons as a fact; and the story of the interference of such exclusively Roman deities as Juppiter and Juno in the fortunes of Ilium was listened to without protest.

The critical methods of modern enquiry have done much to dispel these traditional misconceptions. Many important differences between the deities of Greece and Rome have been sufficiently established; native elements in the religion of Rome have been distinguished from foreign loans, and the dominant note of Greek religion—reverence and imagination—has been shown to be in direct contrast to the practical spirit of the Romans. But the habit of more than twenty centuries is still strong. We are still content, for the most part, to acknowledge Roman religion as the humbler counterpart of that of Greece, reflecting its main essentials in a more lifeless manner; and

to assign the likeness partly to kindred civilisation, but mainly to a common far-off ancestry.

It is the purpose of this discussion to support another view of the case, namely, *that the religions of Greece and Rome are not merely dissimilar, but radically opposed and irreconcilable; that, moreover, while in the mind of the devout and imaginative Greek religion was always a vital force, the original Italic stock hardly possessed a religious sense at all, and only developed it in small measure and by slow degrees under the quickening influence of Greek thinkers.*

A detailed examination of the two religious systems is obviously beyond the scope of this paper. The utmost I can attempt is to give a very brief sketch of the general history of the religions of Greece and Rome, and then proceed roughly to compare the leading features of their respective pantheons and rituals. By way of conclusion, and as a possible explanation, I would suggest that the undoubted racial affinities of the two nations do not extend to their religions; but that these were of independent origin and development.

Beginning with Greece, we find definite traces of the worship of divine beings as far back as we can penetrate into the earliest pre-historic period. Without touching on the difficult question as to the exact ethnical affinity of the Ægean peoples with the Greeks of the Classical period, we can safely assert that the Greeks were their lineal descendants in many matters of custom and civilisation. Now Crete, which was the chief centre of Ægean culture, gives a clearer and more continuous picture of pre-Mycenean* and Mycenean civilisation than any other known site. In Crete we find undoubted indications of the worship of a mother goddess, represented on seal-impressions, on signet-rings, and also plastically in the form of statuettes. There are also traces of the worship of a divine pair, probably of solar origin; but the matriarchal deity is undoubtedly paramount. If early Ægean civilisation passed through an animistic or pandæmonistic stage of worship, this must have taken place so early and been so transient as to produce practically no effect on later worship. There are certainly traces of baetylic cult-objects, such as sacred stones and pillars, also of sacred trees and the mystic double axe. There is nothing, however, to show that these objects are of greater antiquity than those in anthropomorphic form. In all probability they are merely symbolic. There can be no doubt that the chief elements of this prehistoric worship descended into Greek religion. This Cretan mother goddess stands not merely behind the mother goddess of Classical worship, Rhea, but also behind Aphrodite, Artemis, and Persephone. Dr. Tsountas traces an original of Artemis in the goddess of Mycenean gems, who constantly appears, sometimes bending a bow, sometimes

* The word "Mycenean" has been so generally adopted as descriptive of a period, rather than a locality, that its use needs no apology.

throttling a goat or grasping the necks of a brace of birds. Many features of the mother goddess, especially her most frequent symbol and accessory the dove, connect her with the Phœnician Aphrodite, precursor of the Olympian goddess of love and beauty. Lastly, the very interesting Cretan faience statuette of a Snake-goddess, a Chthonian aspect of the mother-goddess, foreshadows Persephone of Classical times.

Organised worship of gods in temples marks a comparatively high stage of development in religion, yet there are indications of temple-worship in the religion of prehistoric Crete. Remains of a temple of exceedingly primitive construction have been found at Ocha, near Mount Carystus, in Eubœa. The foundation of the "Temple of Hera" at Olympia, which possesses nearly all the characteristics of the historic Greek temple, is assigned on good grounds to the eleventh century B.C.

In the civilisation which Homer's poems represent, men worshipped bright and friendly deities, nature-gods of human form and individual characters. These always appear as the guardians and well-wishers of mankind, unless provoked by man's impiety to punish transgression.

The religion of historic times, which still included the goddess of Ægean culture as well as the "Olympians" of Homer, was greatly influenced by contemporary thinkers. At a very early period, the followers of Orpheus taught that purity of life led not only to future happiness, but to final divinity. They propounded a definite cosmogony, provided men with the prospect of a clearly-defined existence after death, and taught the lesson of retributive justice. The tragedians made the first endeavour to reconcile the tales of the Homeric and Hesiodic pantheon with practical ethics. The physicists, in their endeavour to find a "first cause," made a conscious conception of monotheism a possibility for the religious thinker, a possibility which was realised by the loftier minds of the fifth century B.C.

The history of Greek religion, then, shows us a people who from the beginning believed in personal deities, and who worshipped these divine beings as their natural protectors. The changes which Greek religion underwent were mainly the result of internal growth, with the possible exception of Orphic influence, which may have taken its rise in the East. The religion of the Greeks always kept pace with the rapidity of their spiritual and intellectual development. Greek religion was anthropomorphic from the earliest times, with an increasing tendency towards monotheism.

An examination of Roman religion reveals a very different state of things. Our knowledge of early Roman worship is derived from the early festival calendar,* which is especially valuable as having been

* For the manner in which the knowledge of this has been preserved to us, see Warde-Fowler, *Roman Festivals*; Introduction, sections 5 and 6.

compiled previous to the introduction of *Græcus Ritus* into Rome. We are therefore able to examine the characteristics and tendencies of native Roman belief before it was influenced by foreign ideas and ritual. This festival calendar shows that the earliest Romans, though intensely superstitious, knew nothing of personal protecting deities. Warde-Fowler* has made careful examination into the nature of the divine beings worshipped in those festivals which survive from the earliest stratum of civilisation. "These deities," he says, "are either altogether doubtful, or so wanting in clearness and prominence as to be altogether subordinate in interest to the details of ceremony." The ritual employed was of a nature designed to allay the malevolence of evil spirits, rather than to offer devotion to friendly powers. There is no trace whatever of worship of gods in temples, or of any attempt to portray the gods in human form, prior to the introduction of Greek influence. Varro expressly states that "for a hundred and seventy years" (*i.e.*, until the beginning of Capitoline worship as the result of Greek influence) "the Romans made no representations of their gods." Aust† asserts that "the oldest Etruscan representations of gods" (*i.e.*, the oldest examples of anthropomorphic representation in Italy) "can be traced to Greek models." The earliest Roman deities were neither nature-gods nor ethical abstractions;‡ they were simply systematised ideas of activities and functions. Such deities as *Robigus*, *Mildew*, *Terminus*, Boundary, *Portunus*, Harbour, *Consus*, *Saturnus*, *Ops*, which represent the various processes of harvest, etc., are the really characteristic deities of this earlier period. Even the native *Juppiter* of the Romans was, as we learn from the great Iguvian inscription and such festivals as the *Feria Latina*, a wholly impersonal being, until, in later times, he took on the attributes of the Greek Zeus.

The sum-total of ancient Roman worship may be said to have been confined within the limits of an elaborate ceremonial, framed to pacify hostile powers and to keep the spirits of deified functions in a good temper. Its nature was that of "aversion," *ἀποτροπή*, rather than "tendence," *θεραπεύεα*.

The adoption of Greek religious ideas, and the consequent identification of the greater gods of the Greek pantheon with many old Latin divinities, was definitely a conscious and artificial measure. It originated with the introduction of the Sibylline books into Rome by a king of foreign extraction.§ During the Republican period fresh Greek cults were adopted only after periods of national disaster, when Roman gods were felt to be an insufficient protection and outside help was needed. There is, however, little to show that

* *Roman Festivals*, pp. 336 and 337.

† Article on "Juppiter," *Lex.* p. 634.

‡ See Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. A., section 4, p. 20.

§ *i.e.*, Tarquinius, who traced his descent from the family of the "Bacchiadae" of Corinth.

Greek ideas ever affected the beliefs of the great body of Roman citizens. Indeed all evidence points in the opposite direction. During the Republican period the entire management and control of the State religion, including the supervision of the calendar, were entrusted, not to any priests associated with Greek cults, but to the *pontifices*. Now this body of men was always essentially representative of the native element in Roman belief and ritual. The only innovations for which they were responsible were certain new cults of their own creation conceived in the spirit of the ancient worship. Such are the deification of certain moral and mental qualities, *e.g.*, Honos, Mens, Concordia, Pax, Libertas; also the collection of deities called *Indigitamenta*, which represent the events of early childhood,* marriage, various occupations and localities, etc. These new deities, whose creation was modelled on the old system of personifying functions, are, like their prototypes, entirely abstract and impersonal.

Thus in almost every respect the history of Roman religion offers a direct contrast to that of Greece. The Roman deities were neither friendly nor personal. They were not worshipped in temples, nor in the form of images, until the custom was introduced from Greece, nor was the Roman idea of religion progressive. Native Roman religion neither accounted for the creation of the world, nor supplied any prospect of future life or immortality of the soul. It was never anthropomorphic, and the idea of monotheism, so far from being evolved from religious thought, was only possible when the Roman State-religion had ceased to exist except as an effete relic. The only definitely monotheistic teaching† in Rome is to be found in the writings of the eclectic students of Greek philosophy in the days of the Empire.

Such, in brief, is the outline of Greek and Roman religious history. We now proceed to compare, first the pantheons, and secondly the rituals of the two nations.

In the case of the Greeks, it will be well to remember the very diverse origin of their deities, and to be prepared for incongruities which it seems hard to reconcile with the principles of Greek religion propounded above. Many of these deities were legacies from primitive times; some show traces of a totemistic or naturalistic origin, and in no way reflect the feelings of the average Greek of historical times. Again, it was the custom of the Greeks, in colonising any fresh land, to adopt the pre-existing local deities into their own pantheon,—a custom which caused many apparent inconsistencies in their religious system, but hardly affected its real nature. The Greek gods represented, not the creators of the universe, but the abiding forces of nature and of human life. The Greek mind saw a spiritual power

* *e.g.*, Potina, Educa, Cuba, etc

† *e.g.*, Cic., *Tusc. Disp.*, i. 28

actuating every phenomenon and every natural law outside the sphere of man's control, and gave definite corporeal shape to his fancy. Hence, though the multiplicity of definitely conceived Greek gods points to a polytheistic race, the spirit which inspired their worshippers was rather that of the pantheist. Moreover, the anthropomorphism of the Greeks is hardly open to the objection usually urged against the attribution of human shape to the gods, namely, that it confines the god within the limitations of the worshipper, and for that reason leaves nothing to the imagination. The concrete embodiment of the Greek gods in human form was only a means of visualising man's conception of the supernatural: not, as in pagan religions generally, the assignation of a stock shape to a particular god. This is exemplified by the practice of employing the best artists of each successive period to improve on previous portrayals of the divine form, and to create an embodiment in accordance with the highest standards of the time. Such fixed conceptions as that of the dog-headed Anubis of the Egyptian, or the grotesque monstrosities of the Indian pantheon, were impossible in Greece, because the Greek ideal was progressive. The religious systems of most other countries have been definitely antagonistic to intellectual progress. That of Greece was actually its pioneer. The gods of Homer, though full of defects when judged from a modern standpoint, represent in reality a lofty conception for a people who, in some respects, had scarcely emerged from a state of barbarism. Again, in a later age, the teachings of Æschylus, which did much to remould the current conception of the gods, expressed ideas far in advance of current religious belief: yet they were not for this reason regarded as unorthodox. The same is true of succeeding thinkers who left their mark on the religion of Greece. They lived in a country where freedom of thought could find vent in freedom of speech, and preached to a people who were hindered by no ignorant conservatism from giving a fair hearing to new ideas. Dr. Dill* states of the Greeks that "the inner monotheism of loftier minds in paganism was the fruit of a millennium of the freest and most disinterested philosophic movement in history. More than five centuries before Christ, Greek speculation had lifted men's minds to the conception of mysterious unity behind the phantasmagoria of sense."

We have seen that native Roman religion was never anthropomorphic; that the fashion of worshipping gods in temples, and in the form of images, was introduced from Greece, but still remained incompatible with the Roman abstract and impersonal conception of the divine. Until the influence of the Hellenic world began to make itself felt in Rome, the Roman deities can hardly even be said to possess specific individuality. It follows, naturally enough, that these vague and abstract deities were not united in ties of kinship or matrimony.

* "Roman Society in the last Century of the Western Empire."

As Wissowa points out, these gods "stand side by side without any "other connecting link except that which is given to them from their "resemblance to, and affinity with, their sphere of action." It is instructive to observe that the Roman deities find no place in the description given by de la Saussaye* of the essential nature of polytheistic belief. Five characteristics, he states, are involved in a conception of the gods:—

1. They are related to one another as members of a community.
2. With the growth of art, they are represented plastically in the image of man.
3. As ethics advance moral benefits are associated with their worship.
4. They are conceived of as personal individual beings, ideally good and beautiful.
5. Since human intellect demands a system, a theogony or cosmogony is drawn up.

The Roman deities of native origin fail, it will be seen, to satisfy any one of these conditions.

Again, a fundamental principle of all religions that possess any claim to spirituality is the absolute separation of the human from the divine. Yet we may question whether the majority of Roman deities had any existence separate from the men who worshipped them. Certainly no such distinction exists in the case of that class of spirits called *genii*,—as, for example, *Hercules*, man's attendant spirit, or the woman's genius, *Juno*, which found their origin in manifestations of the "external "soul." Hero-worship, moreover, as F. B. Jevons† points out, was unknown to the Romans, because heroes,—being by nature closely akin to the gods,—had for them no definite existence. The Italian deities were mere fetishes, magical implements. As Mommsen observes, "The "god of the Italian was, above all things, an instrument for helping "him to the attainment of very solid earthly objects"

The idea of contract in the relation of gods and men perhaps finds its place in the early stages of nearly all religions. Yet the particular value of the propitiatory sacrifice in the estimation of the gods forms a subject which has never, I believe, received much comment. It is worthy of notice that the offerings of men were believed to be quite as important to the gods as the protection of the gods was to men. Thus we find in the "Homeric Hymns":—

καὶ νῦν κε πάμπαν ἔλεσσε γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,
καὶ θνητῶν ἡμέρας' Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντας
εἰ μὴ Ζεὺς ἐνόησεν. κ.τ.λ.

Zeus at length interfered, in order to prevent the gods being deprived of their sacrifices.

* *Religionsgeschichte*.

† Introduction to Plutarch's *Roman Questions*: Translation.

Again, *ibid.*:—

ἔταί μέγα μῆδεταί ἔργον
ψθίσαι ψῦλ' ἀμένηνα καμαργάνων ἀνθρώπων
σπέρμ' ὑπὸ γῆς κρύπτουσα, καταφθινύθουσα δὲ τίμας
ἀθανάτων. κ.τ.λ.

The idea is, properly speaking, a primitive one, but in the case of the Romans it continued inseparable from the spirit of bargaining in which their prayers were always conceived. For this reason it hardly surprises us to find the same sentiment current in the Augustan age, when Horace writes:—

Quid *dedicatum* poscit Apollinem
uates, quid orat de patera nouum
fundens liquorem?

The study of ritual is of great assistance in helping us to understand the attitude of the worshipper towards the divine power; and the difference between Greek and Roman ceremonial is as striking as the difference between the Greek and Roman conception of the gods. To begin with, the Greeks worshipped the gods with their heads uncovered—an attitude of respect to higher powers. The Romans covered their heads to pray. This custom seemed so surprising that writers of a late period exercised their utmost ingenuity to account for it. Plutarch in his "Roman Questions" gives several fantastic explanations, the most plausible of which describes it as a measure taken to avoid sounds and sights which might be ill-omened. The true explanation would seem to be that suggested by F. B. Jevons, who ascribes the custom to the class of gods worshipped. Among the Romans of the most primitive stage, whose religion amounted to little more than an instinct of self-preservation against the unknown, worship took the form of appeasing unseen powers which might be malignant; the only unseen powers definitely conceived of were the spirits of departed ancestors. Now Jevons shows the many points of resemblance between the primitive notion of departed spirits and the conception of fairies of modern folk-lore, and recalls the universal superstition that fairies resent being seen by mortals. The conclusion seems obvious.

Again, the Greeks in very early times regarded their gods as guardians of morality, and as such they approached them with clean body and raiment, free from taint of sin or pollution. As early as Homer, the idea of "clean hands and a pure heart" was familiar to the mind of the normal Greek worshipper.

χέρσιν ἀνέπτουσιν Διὶ λάβειν αἶθοπα αἶνον
ἄζομαι, οὐδέ τι ἔστι κελαινεφέα Κρονίωνι
αἵματι καὶ λίθῳ πεπαλαγμένον εὐχετάσθαι.

In the early stages of the development of art as an exponent of

religion, so says Gruppe,* men were losing sight of the actual material value of the sacrifice and the circumstance of prayer, and laying more stress on the intention of the worshipper. As early as the period of heroic poetry, prayer and sacrifice had become a privilege as well as a duty, since the actual communion which it implied gave it a deeper meaning. In this respect Greek ethics were not far removed from the standard of Christian godliness. Men also prayed the gods to bestow "blessings" rather than the fulfilment of definite earthly desires. The ideas which Gruppe thus describes were entirely Greek in origin and development, though perhaps they find no place in literature until a much later period. For their concrete expression we must turn to the cosmopolitan writers of the Roman Empire, who drew freely on Greek thought for their ethical teaching. The gist of Juvenal's tenth satire is that blessings chosen by divine wisdom, rather than definite earthly boons, should be the object of prayer. So also Persius:—"Give me rather such offerings as . . . duty to God "and man well blended in the mind, purity in the shrine of the heart, "and nobleness pervading the bosom. Let me have these to carry to "the temple, and a handful of meal shall win me acceptance."

In native Roman practice prayer and thanksgiving were valueless, unless offered with formal and detailed observance. Ritual was of supreme moment, and its complexities were so elaborate that the knowledge of them was in itself a profession. The Romans needed an intermediary between them and their gods; hence the institution of almost innumerable priesthoods and other religious bodies. "The religion of Rome," in the words of Preller, "was above all things a religion of ceremonial." De la Saussaye ventures further in maintaining that "in Rome, "as in China, Assyria and Babylonia, the cult was nothing but "organised magic." Magic was alien to the Greeks, who regarded it as an impious and barbarian practice. Circe and Medea were foreigners, and were always looked upon with abhorrence. The only deity with whom magic and sorcery were ever associated was *Hecate*, but there is no mention of her in Homer, or in the Homeric cycle, which suggests that her origin was non-Hellenic. Indeed, Strabo asserts that her associations are Phrygo-Thracian: moreover, her particularly Chthonian character did not become prominent until comparatively late times. But to the Roman "the forces of nature, "regarded as *numina*, rather than moral ideas, might well be influenced "to his advantage." And we can hardly be wrong in concluding with Jevons that "to control a deity by means other than prayer and "a good life is antitheistic."† The same distinction is observed in the method of ascertaining the will of the divine power. The Greeks consulted their oracles; the Romans resorted to divination. "An

* *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*. III. section 288, p. 1047, *ad. fin.*

† See also Sir Alfred Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*. Bk. II.

"oracle is the voice of a god; divination is sympathetic magic
"inverted."

It cannot, of course, be argued that Greek religious teaching had always a high ethical value; perhaps it was never consciously moral. Yet the religious instinct of the Greeks aimed at the highest of which they were capable in every domain. It was religious instinct which taught the Greeks that an ideal lay beyond all human attainment. It was in the service of religion that they produced their noblest works,—a literature and art which have never been rivalled. In actual spirituality they may have shown themselves inferior to the writers of the Vedic poems, whose religion was that of self-repression rather than self-culture. In abstract justice they may have been surpassed by Rome, because practical utility taught the Romans that justice prospered. But it was religion that inspired the Greeks to be content with nothing short of excellence; not because of any material gain which might attach to it, but because inferiority was unworthy. It is a significant fact that *virtue*, to the Greeks, was *ἀρετή*, that is "excellence" in every application. The religious observance of the Greeks was, no doubt, full of defects and shortcomings, but there is no need why we should regard these as inherent in the Greek conception of religion. Andrew Lang explains the contradictory conception of Zeus as "an overgrowth of myth on the stock of an idea "originally noble," and explains the frank immorality of the gods as being in great measure the result of "aristocratic mythmaking and "genealogical mania." Without necessarily adopting so extreme a view, we can at least agree with his statement that "man cannot live "always on the level of his best intellectual ideas," and therefore all human attainment falls short of its profession.

The progressive and vital spirit of Greek religion is further instanced by the Greek attitude towards death and future life. The most primitive stage was belief in a world of powerful spirits—disembodied souls of the dead. Those who had been injured in their lifetime were chiefly occupied in avenging themselves upon the living, and for this reason were objects of fear and propitiation. By the time of Homer, the Greeks had completely outgrown this stage; for the souls of the dead have dwindled to mere shadows of human life,—*ψυχαὶ κάρηνα*. They still pursue their earthly occupations, but consciousness and active power have left them. Their lot is so gloomy that a Homeric warrior speaks of it in utter horror:—

Fain were I on earth's acres e'en to serve beneath the hand
Of a master scanty in portion, and lacking share of the land,
Rather than here to lord it among the dead outworn.

The natural desire to form a less doleful picture of a future world led, in post-Homeric times, to a conception of the Elysian fields, to

which those specially beloved of the gods at length attained. In the sixth century before Christ, under the influence of Orphic teaching originally, there grew up a definite idea of immortality of the soul and possibility of attaining divine existence, dependent on purity and holiness of life in this world. The clearest literary reference to this belief occurs in a famous passage in the second Olympian Ode of Pindar, where he states that "the good" live a life of pleasure and ease among the blessed gods for ever, but that "those others" suffer pain too grievous to behold. Gruppe* shows that the Greeks, after passing through the different phases of fear towards the dead, in the earliest period, and the Homeric attitude of indifference, at length reach the stage of definite belief in the immortality of the soul. ". . . Sentiments just as tender stir the heart of the devout Greek "of the best period towards the dead . . . Death is powerless to "sever the bond of affection; the devout man still feels that he is "near his beloved dead."

So in Sophocles,—to quote one of many instances,—we find :—

ἐσέβαν τὰ πρὸς θεοῖς,
ὥς τᾶλλ' ἅπαντα δεύτερ' ἡγείται πάτηρ
Ζεὺς; οὐ γὰρ εὐσέβεια συνθήσκει βροτοῖς.

Roman religion on the other hand, that is to say, religion as evolved by the Roman mind before it became subject to outside influence, appears conspicuously lacking in living force. It was little more than a narrow and conventional system destined for use in practical life. According to the description given by Dr. Dill,† "the old Roman "worship was a hard, narrow and inexpansive system of abstraction "and personification; . . . unlike the mythologies of the East, it had "no native principle of growth, or power of adaptation to the altered "needs of society and the individual imagination." In the word "system" we have the key at once to the essential nature and the most striking defect of Roman religion. Like all conventions it was based on public utility rather than personal needs; and by its very nature it was incapable of satisfying the spiritual cravings of the individual. "To allow devotional feeling to transgress the bounds "prescribed by immemorial custom was *superstitio*." It was this need which drove the more spiritually minded of the Romans to abandon their national faith for that of Greece, in which they found a vital principle capable of growth and expansion. There was room in Greek religion for the development of thought, and the most unorthodox of Greek thinkers was able to propound his theories without a conscious renunciation of national belief. Roman religion was definitely incompatible with free thought, and it was the perception

* *Op. cit.* III., section 288, p. 1048.

† "Roman Society in the last Century of the Empire."

of this paralysing influence that impelled Lucretius to preface his teaching with an indignant attack on religion in general:—

humana ante oculos foede cum vita jaceret
in terris oppressa gravi sub religione,
quae caput a caeli regionibus ostendebat
horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans . . .

It is an accident that the examples he quotes of religious tyranny are Greek; the system in which Lucretius had been reared, and from whose trammels his mind struggled to free itself, was Roman.

At the same time, the statement that the Romans were deficient in religious sense is not intended to imply that they were lacking in "*virtus*." Indeed, righteous dealing was a marked characteristic of the Roman race. The curious feature of the Roman ethical code was its complete separation from religion. It was inspired by the prevailing spirit of utilitarianism, and upheld by public feeling as a social necessity. Duty to the State, ambition, the necessity for co-operative action and harmony, would prevent the average Roman from violating the natural laws of justice.

The idea of a future life, moreover, was definitely outside the sphere of native Roman religion, which recognised no gods beyond the powers that protected Rome. Just as native Roman thought concerned itself with nothing anterior* to the foundation of Rome, so it was incapable of recognising a future existence dissociated from the State life. Belief in a uniform realm of the dead was never evolved by the Roman mind; it was imported late from Greece.

It may, perhaps, be urged that it is unfair systematically to neglect the Greek element in Roman religion, since its influence was felt so early and became so widespread.

The early introduction of Greek ideas into Italy is undoubted; the extent of their influence is very much a matter for personal opinion.

To suppose that Rome, while still a young and vigorous nation, entering upon a career of almost unbroken conquest, voluntarily adopted the whole religious system of a foreign and afterwards subject people, is to suppose a thing without parallel in history. The fact that Greek thought largely dominated literature is in itself no argument, since native Roman ideas were wholly lacking in imagination, and therefore incapable of providing subject matter fit for literary treatment. On the other hand, we know for certain that many native beliefs and cults continued unaltered throughout the Republic; while others,† purely Roman in spirit, were evolved at a comparatively late period in the history of Roman religion. The real loan of Greece to Rome was something outside the sphere of actual belief. It was the product of imagination and fancy, which Rome borrowed to

* Wissowa. *Op. cit.* A, section 4, p. 23, *ad. init.*

† e.g., The collection of deities called "*Indigitamenta*," etc.

supplement a defect inherent in herself. For this reason the Greek element in Roman religion remained a thing apart. It was never properly assimilated, or incorporated into its real nature.

The purpose of this discussion has been to maintain and illustrate a radical difference between the two religious systems,—a difference which has been unduly neglected in the endeavour to emphasise their points of mutual resemblance, and has never received satisfactory explanation. We would suggest, as a possible theory, that the religions of the two nations cannot be traced to a common source, but that they were of independent origin and development.

In the first place, the date of the occupation of the Italian Peninsula by the Italic peoples appears to have been anterior to that of the Hellenisation of Greece. The evidence of archæology points to an immigration of these peoples from the north, some time between the fourteenth and twelfth century B.C. In Greece, on the other hand, though the first Hellenic invasion may have been as early as the twelfth century B.C., the Mycenaean age cannot be said to have ended until about the tenth century. The Italians were, moreover, in a very primitive stage of development at the time of their entrance into the Italian Peninsula. Warde Fowler, in his analysis of the Roman festival calendar, has shown that such essentially Italian objects of worship as the stone of Terminus, the oak of Juppiter Feretrius, etc., are survivals of the most primitive condition of human life in ancient Latium, and that the later developments of Roman religion down to the time of Numa, as reflected in the Roman festivals, are purely of Latin growth. Roman religion thus began and developed in Latium alone. If we wish to find parallels to native Roman religion we must seek them among tribes of the most primitive state of barbarism. Its affinities are with the beliefs of non-Aryan peoples. For example, Sir W. Hunter, writing of an aboriginal tribe in India, says, "The Santal has no knowledge of bright and friendly gods, such as the Vedic singers of the Aryan Indians worshipped. Still less can he imagine one omnipotent and beneficent deity, who watches over mankind. . . . He thinks that the earth swarms with demons, whose ill-will he tries to avert by the sacrifice of goats, cocks, and chickens. There are the ghosts of his forefathers, river-spirits, forest-spirits, well-demons, mountain-demons, and a mighty host of unseen beings, whom he must keep in a good humour." The description might with equal truth have been written of the early Romans.

The beginnings of Greek religion cannot, on the other hand, be traced back to an Hellenic home. It is true that it embraced many rites and beliefs of a primitive character; but these can definitely be assigned to the autochthonous element in the Greek peoples. They are an inheritance from the Mycenaean and pre-Mycenaean inhabitants of the Ægean area. The vital and progressive part of Greek religion

must have been brought by the Greek invaders from their home north of the Greek Peninsula. The Olympian deities show a close resemblance to the gods of the early Indian pantheon in the earliest Sanskrit writings. These are described as bright and beneficent beings, possessing definite qualities and personalities, and conspicuous for their surpassing strength and beauty. Such beings differ in every respect from the native deities of Latium. Nor is it only in the persons of their gods that the Greek and Vedic religions are akin. As Greek religion develops we find many ideas and beliefs which harmonise with the spirit of the Vedas. A definite cosmogony was not an original part of Hellenic belief; but with the introduction of Orphic* doctrines it was readily accepted and reconciled with the previous notion that the origin of the gods was subsequent to the foundation of the world. The followers of Orpheus, whose teaching may possibly have been derived from the East,† created the necessary link. They stated that Time was the original principle; that Æther and Chaos came into being; that from these Time created an egg, from which sprang Phanes, god of light, whose revelation marks the development of the world. One of the most remarkable hymns in the Rig-Veda‡ describes the mystery of creation in language which strongly recalls the first chapter of Genesis:—

Then there was neither day nor night nor light nor darkness,
Only the Existent One breathed calmly self-contained:
Next all was water, all a chaos indiscrete,
In which the One lay void, shrouded in nothingness.
Then turning inward, He by self-developed force
Of inner fervour and intense abstraction grew. . . .
How and from what has sprung this universe? The gods
Are subsequent themselves to its development.

Again, monotheism in Greece steadily gained ground among the more cultured classes under the influence of Ionian reason. In the first Mandala of the Rig-Veda we find it fully developed:—

What god shall we adore with sacrifice?
Him let us praise, the golden child that rose
In the beginning, who was born the lord,
. who made
The earth, and formed the sky, who giveth life,
Who giveth strength, whose bidding gods revere.
. The only God
Above the Gods. May he not injure us.
He the creator of the earth, the righteous
Creator of the sky, Creator too
Of Oceans bright and far-extending waters.

* See Gruppe. III. *Religionsgeschichte*, section 169, pp. 419, 420.

† See Gruppe. III. *Religionsgeschichte* section 286, p. 1016.

‡ The translations are those of Sir M. Monier-Williams.

It has been shown that belief in a future life and retributive justice was gradually adopted as Greek religious thought became more enlightened. In a Vedic hymn addressed to Agni, god of fire, we find the following prayer:—

Purge us from taint of sin, and when we die
Deal mercifully with us on the pyre;
Burning our bodies with their load of guilt,
But bearing our eternal part on high
To luminous abodes and realms of bliss
Forever there to dwell with righteous men.

Again in a hymn to death,

Return unto thy home, O soul; thy sin and shame
Leave thou behind on earth; assume a shining form—
Thy ancient shape,—refined and from all taint set free.

Greek religion, then, has definite affinities with that of the Aryan-speaking peoples to whom is due the composition of the Vedas. Roman religion resembles neither, and can be paralleled only by comparison with the most barbaric cults.

Is it not a possible inference that the Italian peoples diverged from the common Aryan-speaking stock previous to the development of definite religious ideas; while the Greeks, and the ancestors of the invaders of India, remained in contact with one another for a longer period? This inference is perhaps supported by the evidence of language. Philologists are generally agreed that in spite of the undoubted relation between Latin and Greek, the true affinity of the Italic languages is with the Celtic group.

In this connection a statement of de Quatrefages, quoted by Professor Keane,* is interesting:—"The primitive Greek skull appears "to present a very close resemblance to that of high-caste Hindus, "and this in its turn almost exactly reproduces that of the "dolichocephalous Persians."

This, however, does not profess to be more than a suggestion of a possible explanation. It is not desired to press a point which cannot properly be argued without the assistance of ethnological and philological science.

E. AGNES R. HAIGH.

* Ethnology p. 407.

BELGIUM AND THE CONGO.

MR. EDWARD DICEY has an article in the *Empire Review* for December, 1907, which is directed, in effect, against the movement for Congo reform in this country. That movement has, step by step and in the teeth of enormous difficulties, compelled exposure; it forced King Leopold to send out a Commission whose Report was so damning that it convinced the most sceptical, though the evidence which it took was so appalling that King Leopold suppressed it, lock, stock and barrel, contrary to his pledge given to Lord Lansdowne; and it has driven King Leopold, within six months of declaring that he was opposed to Belgian annexation and that those who demanded it were his "enemies," to allow annexation to be brought officially forward. As might have been expected, Mr. Dicey treats the question entirely from the standpoint of European politics. As an African question it does not interest him. Probably, if one may say so without offence, he has not, to judge from his remarks, studied it from the standpoint of African politics at all. He does not wish to appear to condone "cruelties," and, of course, no one would for a moment credit him with such an intention. But he is inclined to think these "cruelties" exaggerated, and more or less inevitable. In any case we ought not to trouble ourselves about them; above all, we should be aware of "sentiment" in politics. Briefly put, his opinion is that we must let matters take their course, and leave the Congo natives to their fate.

It is a poor and a familiar creed—this dismissal of great moral issues as "sentiment"; this everlasting appeal to selfish interests; this deprecation of all that is noble and sound in a nation, that which from time to time indicates the existence among us of a Christianity more than nominal and official; this waving aside of the forces of national consciousness as necessarily irresponsible, uncalculating, unwise, fanatical. It is a poor creed, this, which waves the flag of international complications when a great wrong requires redress, while

it might justify war for a coaling station or a gold mine, a sphere of influence or a ten per cent. interest.

I shall attempt to meet Mr. Dicey on his own ground. But, first, what is the basis of this movement? What is its object? Why have men who are neither sentimentalists, nor fanatics, nor unread fools, lent their names and activities, and sacrificed their time and leisure to this cause of the Congo? Look through the list of names that are identified with the movement; you will see Conservative and Liberal and Labour Members of Parliament, Bishops and Free Church leaders, men in every walk of life, men with great experience of affairs, professional men. Look at the list of cities and towns which have officially recorded their protest; such a list has never been drawn up in this or any other country: at the height of his power Mr. Gladstone, thundering against the Bulgarian outrages, could not have produced such a list. At a time of bitter sectarian strife men have been brought together and learned, on this common platform of the Congo, to know one another and respect one another's views. Responsible statesmen in and out of office have vied with each other in the earnestness and force of their denunciation. No words have been used by "professional agitators" stronger than that celebrated phrase of Lord Lansdowne's, which summarises the situation: "Bondage under the most barbarous and inhuman conditions, imposed for mercenary motives of the most selfish character." It must be something out of the ordinary, this movement which has coupled up all these elements and fused them with a common determination. Would a simple, unreasoning impulse against "cruelties" have sufficed? It is much more than that, as Mr. Dicey would understand if his creed permitted him.

It is an effort to save the African tropics from being ruined for the benefit, and by the deliberate action, of individuals in Europe; to preserve its people from being destroyed; to prevent its economic riches from being exhausted, and its future, both from the European and the African point of view, from being irremediably impaired for generations to come. "Cruelties" are but an excrescence of the system which we seek to destroy. If the effort fails it will be through lack of moral courage and through the shortsightedness of the governing statesmen of the world; not because any authority, however eminent, has succeeded in demonstrating that our case is weak; for after five years of every imaginable form of assault, from legal quibble to personal attack, it remains unshaken. It is, indeed, unshakable.

We ask for nothing for the Congo native other than the most elementary right of man—the right to buy and to sell freely the produce of the soil of his country, which he alone can gather, and which he alone to the end of time will be able to gather. We say that tropical Africa is a black man's country and always will be; that

if the fruits of its soil are to be gathered and harvested, the black man must share in the proceeds; that its riches can only be developed by the black man, and that there are only two ways in which those riches can be put into circulation for the common weal, by commerce or by compulsion. We contend that the only justifiable, the only normal, the only common-sense basis of relationship between the white man and the black in the latter's country is the basis recognised by all European administrations in the African tropics and sub-tropics except the Congo, the basis of sale and purchase, the operation of normal economic laws. We assert that a system which by a stroke of the pen sweeps away native land tenure, appropriates the negotiable wealth of the land, and by a natural sequence—since the claim is preposterously absurd without its necessary corollary—regards native labour as the personal possession of absentee landlords in Europe, is a system which is not only barbarous and monstrous, but an anti-civilised agency, inimical to the world's interests and antagonistic to the European democracies which, in the ultimate resort, invest the governing element with authority to acquire dependencies in the tropical zone. That, put very shortly, is our case.

And now for Mr. Dicey's principal contention. Nothing must be done by England to put an end to this system, because to do so will be "fatal to European peace." Why? He does not tell us; he merely states that our motives are suspected. They were. I do not think they are now in any responsible quarters. If the Powers have hung back from interference, it is not because they believe that we wish to seize the Congo for ourselves, but because they all know—as we know—that the Congo is a *damnosa hereditas*; that a terribly heavy bill will have to be paid some day for the crass stupidity displayed in allowing matters to go on as they have been doing for the last twelve years; and because none of them are anxious to pay that bill. They prefer that little Belgium should pay it all by herself; and they cheer her on, and allow her to think that they are deceived by the talk of "national patrimony," and so on. There is probably not one leading statesman in the world to-day who really in his heart of hearts believes that the annexation of the Congo by Belgium will be anything but a disastrous undertaking for her; but they are willing to acquiesce in the bluffing process which is being carried on in Belgium and of which the Belgian people will be the victims. But even if it were true that our motives are suspected, the argument is not one which would prevent a strong statesman from doing his duty. It rates British statesmanship very low.

A state of affairs "fatal to the interests of European peace" will arise not from action but from inaction; not from pressure or even coercion (and nothing but plain speech is needed at this juncture), but from permitting the Belgian people, who have not been consulted

on the matter of annexation at all, to be committed by the governing element in Belgium to-day and by politicians, with no mandate from the nation, preoccupied first and foremost with their domestic politics, to an annexation on lines which perpetuate in its essentials the existing system. Many Belgians feel this in the marrow of their bones. One Belgian has the courage to say so—Georges Lorand; and he is one of the best informed men in the Belgian House. What are the arguments in favour of this contention? I will venture to indicate some of them in a few words.

If Belgium annexes the Congo, a step will have been taken momentous in its consequences to the world at large, to Belgium and to the native races of the Congo. Why to the world at large? For this reason. Belgium is a small European kingdom, whose independence, and later whose neutrality was guaranteed by the Powers at the instance of Great Britain. From the day that she annexed the Congo, Belgium would become mistress of a territory in Africa slightly larger than Germany, Austro-Hungary, France, Italy, Switzerland and Portugal combined. Belgium would thus rank as one of the greatest of African Powers, and her position in Europe could not but be affected by her position in Africa. If the nature of Belgian rule as an African Power were such as to bring Belgium into diplomatic conflict with other African Powers, her neighbours in Africa and in Europe, it might be difficult, if not impossible, to localise such a conflict. And it is important to bear in mind in this connection that the fundamental conception of Leopoldian rule on the Congo to-day, a conception which it is sought to perpetuate under the Belgian flag, constitutes in effect an exhibition of the grossest bad faith and chicanery towards all the Great Powers that signed the Berlin Act, and without whose consent the Congo State would not have come into existence. By claiming and exercising personal ownership over the produce of the soil, King Leopold and his *cessionnaires* have driven a coach and four through Article V. of the Berlin Act, which declares that there shall be no monopolies in matters of trade, and completely stultifies one of the motive causes of the Congo State's creation. It may be juridically "smart" to declare that the elements of trade have ceased to be such by the waving of a magic wand which has converted them into the "property" of absentee landlords, and that consequently the Act has not been infringed. But, in point of fact, it is the most demonstrable of absurdities. The absence of a specific material interest of sufficient importance has alone prevented action on the part of any one or more of the Great Powers. But that is a slender thread to hang safety upon. The Bremen and Hamburg Chambers of Commerce, the German Colonial Society, and other public bodies, have repeatedly protested against the violation of Article V.; and if Belgium should annex the territory without revolutionising this

system—which is the *fons et origo mali* of the whole affair—she is left open any day, on any pretext, to a serious quarrel with her neighbours. Belgium independent and neutral is one of the requirements of the European equilibrium. With annexation on the lines insisted upon by King Leopold and his supporters, Belgium leaves her flanks exposed, and becomes once more a menace to the cause of international peace. Take a supposititious case; one which is, however, permanently on the cards, so to speak. A powerful, genuine, honest trading company is formed in Germany to carry on commercial intercourse with the natives of the Congo, which, by the Act of Berlin, is free commercial land. Belgium seeks to parry the danger by offering the directors of the Company a territorial concession conferring upon the *concessionnaire*, in accordance with the new dispensation, proprietorship over the produce of the soil. They decline any such concession. They merely wish to trade with the people of the land; as they do in Nigeria, for instance. What is Belgium going to do under the present system, which denies that the native has any rights in land or in the produce of the soil, and insists that the said produce belongs to the Belgian State, or to *concessionnaires*, that it is the raw material not of commerce, but of “taxation?” A conflict would immediately arise; and Germany would be in the right. Moreover, her hands are clean: she established the same system in the Cameroons, but she soon saw that it was at variance in practice with the most elementary notions of right in relationship with the natives and with Europeans, and she has declined to permit trade to be interfered with. If we are so vastly afraid of Germany supporting Belgium against us, if Belgium annexes the Congo on lines incompatible with international treaties to which we have appended our signature—although such objection on our part would not only do nothing to infringe German interests, but would actually be on all fours with German protests—where is the sense of agreeing to annexation of this kind which will leave it open to Germany to pick a quarrel, and a perfectly legitimate quarrel too, with Belgium any day she chooses?

Why would annexation by Belgium on the conditions desired by King Leopold prove a momentous step for Belgium herself? For this reason. Even if the position of Belgium on the international chess board were not such as is indicated above, her annexation of a great tropical dependency would be a formidable undertaking. Belgium covers a little more than one-third the area of Ireland. Her population is one-sixth larger than greater London, composed in almost equal parts of two distinct peoples, each having its own national tongue. She owns neither navy nor mercantile marine; she has powerful neighbours, and possesses no Colonial experience, unless the pestilent ideals inculcated during the last fifteen years by the King and his *entourage* can be called experience. It would be

an undertaking which, if the royal camarilla were not so powerful as it is, no patriotic Belgian would consent to assume without the most exhaustive investigation, the fullest knowledge and the most careful consideration; an undertaking, one might add, which none of the Great Powers, anxious in the general interests of peace that the position of Belgium in Europe should not be disturbed, or professing a generous friendship for the Belgian people, ought to allow Belgium to embark upon unless the people of that country had in the regular constitutional manner been made acquainted with all the facts, and had given upon those facts a truly national response in the affirmative.

Moreover the natural accompaniment of the existing system, which is robbery pure and simple, is violence. No community will submit to be pillaged as the Congo races have been and are being pillaged without forcible objection. But in this particular case violence is more than ever the indispensable feature of the scheme, for without it the robber could not enter into possession of that which he has stolen, on paper. If King Leopold and his financial associates could send to the Congo an army of European labourers to collect the natural wealth which he has appropriated, that appropriation would still remain an indefensible invasion of human rights. But he cannot do so. Hence upon the original outrage must be grafted another, or the former is sterile in financial results. The country must be held down literally by force. King Leopold's army, regular and irregular, is larger than the forces of all the African Powers put together in tropical and sub-tropical Africa. The official figures are false.* This army has to be fed; its women have to be fed; its retainers have to be fed, and every soldier stationed in the villages has retainers. All this devolves upon the unfortunate natives of the country, and is a burden as heavy to bear as the rubber "tax"; and so we find Consul Casement and Vice-Consuls Michell and Armstrong, to say nothing of the missionaries, describing the country as enslaved and the people as groaning beneath a burden greater than they can bear, better off under the Arabs, and so on. All this Belgium *must* keep up if she annexes on the basis of the present system. And think what it means. A more or less perpetual state of war has endured for the past fifteen years on the Congo. With every year that passes there is an increase in the area affected by this system, an increase in the area of disturbance; an increase in the number of soldiers, the only possible instruments of such a system; an increase in the quantity of material of war imported into the country affected; increased chances of rebellion on the part of native soldiery, not levied for the purpose of maintaining peace and order, but for the purpose of compelling the

* This article was written before the publication of the Congo Transfer Treaty. In Annex B to this document, the assets of the Congo State are seen to include 25,534 Albini rifles, 6,850,000 rounds of ball cartridge, and 185 field pieces of various patterns; and this armament is confined to about one-third of the territory only—the "National domain."

native communities to labour three hundred days in the year collecting "taxes" (otherwise stated, the produce of the soil of commercial value in Europe); increased hatred of the white man and all his ways, with the ever possible contingency that such hatred may lead to combination or even to co-operation between native soldiery and some powerful chief with organising ability. In short, as the late M. Ballay, Governor-General of French West Africa, declared, figuratively but truly, this policy needs "a soldier behind every producer." It means the conversion of an enormous portion of Central Africa into an armed camp, erected over a powder magazine of native hatred; an armed camp in which European control must necessarily be limited. It is a perpetual threat to the peace of Africa and to the legitimate self-interest, as Lord Percy rightly stated in the House two years ago, of the Congo's neighbours—Belgium's neighbours of the future.

It is not my intention to treat of the humanitarian aspect of the Congo question here, or of the special responsibilities which we as a nation had in the creation of the Congo State—responsibilities which make it incumbent on our part to take the lead in compelling a radical alteration of the present state of affairs, whether under the Belgian or any other flag; nor yet to point out the means which the British Government possess to bring King Leopold's rule to an end and prevent the perpetuation of his system. I merely adduce some of the arguments which, I think, show that to allow the present condition of things to continue, and to wash our hands of the terms under which Belgium, if she annexes, decides to take over the Congo, is not only to confer a signal disservice upon the Belgian people, but is to imperil the peace of the world—at least to imperil it far more than by taking the straightforward course which common sense and duty alike demand.

E. D. MOREL.

THE JAPANESE IN KOREA.

THE long-robed, solemn-visaged Korean statesman and myself had sat for hours, squatted upon the floor in his home, discussing the tragedy of his nation. His Emperor was a prisoner; he himself had been driven from office because he would not be a tool of the newcomers; and the land was ringing with complaints of almost intolerable tyranny. "If the nations know of what is happening here, will they not help us?" my host asked. I replied that he must expect nothing from Europe; for it would have been cruel to encourage him to hope. Thereupon he turned to me with sudden passion. "Are you white people blind? Can you not see further than to-day? You think that because Korea is weak and poor, and because her old Government was imperfect, therefore you can safely allow Japan to swallow her. I tell you that the tiger's appetite grows with what it feeds on. Korea is the victim to-day; to-morrow it will be Manchuria, and afterwards China. Where will your European trade be then? What then will be the value of the prestige of the white man among the hundreds of millions of Asia?"

The Korean minister spoke with reason. The passing of Korea is no isolated event, lacking interest for us. It is one of the pivotal points in a great world movement, charged with endless possibilities for both East and West. We have here not only a nation *in extremis*, but also a nation on trial. The action of Japan in this matter supplies a touchstone, by which the West will judge the genuineness of her civilisation, and the reality of her professions of justice and disinterestedness. Korea has been wiped off the map. Her twelve million people to-day occupy a position of semi-servitude, forbidden to own arms, subject to the control of alien soldiery, liable to forced labour, often expelled from their homes, and without voice or lot in their own affairs. Her Emperor has been driven from his throne and lies a prisoner in his palace; some of her leading statesmen have been forced into exile and others driven to suicide; and her army has been disbanded. She has been deprived of all means

of making her case known through official channels. Freedom, property rights, independence, and individual safety have all gone. Yet a ruined and devastated Korea may even now present to the world a magic mirror in which to see the possible development of the Far East.

To understand the bearings of the Korean situation to-day, it is necessary to go back. Up to 1876, the Hermit Kingdom rigidly refrained from intercourse with the outside world, and allowed no foreigners admittance. America and France attempted to force an entry by expeditionary parties, but both failed. Each year a body of Korean delegates arrived in Peking, bearing tribute to the Emperor of China. Their quaint dress, their horsehair hats, their dignified deportment, and the manner in which they kept themselves apart from white men added to the mystery that surrounded their land. Korea became a kind of wonder-country, and the wildest stories were eagerly swallowed about its riches and the ways of its people.

Japan, by patient diplomacy backed by force, broke down the barriers, and the nations entered. Foreign Legations were established in Seoul in the early eighties, and Korean representatives were sent to Europe and America. Regular steamship services were opened; Korean students settled abroad, and freedom of trade was secured. The first impressions of the foreigners in Korea were not very favourable. They found that the land was poor, the Government was corrupt, the habits of the people dirty, and the national spirit apparently broken. After a time missionaries entered, obtained liberty to preach, and scored great triumphs. The missionaries reported that the rural dwellers were kindly, sympathetic, willing to learn, and only kept back by the abuses of their administration. Signs of reform began to appear, even in the Court. The King and Queen, an amiable and attractive couple, welcomed foreign teachers, Europeans were gradually appointed as advisers and heads of administrative departments. The Customs became an independent branch of the Chinese service. A good commencement was made in education. In the early nineties it seemed that Korea would move slowly, stumblingly, but certainly, along the road of reform.

At that time, Korea was under the shadowy suzerainty of China, and in recognition of it Korean delegates paid their periodical tribute to Peking as already stated. The Chinese Minister, Mr. Yuan—now known to all men as Viceroy Yuan Shih Kai, leader of the reform movement in China—claimed certain privileges, such as the right to ride to the inner way of the palace, while other diplomats had to trudge through the mud of the courtyards. Japan had already marked out her course of Imperial expansion, and one of the first steps in it was to be the removal of Chinese suzerainty over Korea. This was done cleanly and expeditiously by the Chino-Japanese War, and Korea was declared independent.

The immediate result was that Japanese influence became predominant in Seoul. The Japanese tried to Westernise the Koreans in a hurry. They started many crude, if well-intentioned schemes, such as attempting to compel the men to cut off their symbolical top knots. The Queen of Korea, a much stronger personality than her husband, opposed them, and was murdered in peculiarly atrocious fashion. This brought about a reaction, and the Japanese lost their hold. Russia had already cast longing eyes on Korea, seeing there a natural terminus for her trans-Siberian railway, and the satisfaction of her natural desire for an open water port on the Pacific. Between 1895 and 1904 Korean politics were little more than a see-saw between Russian and Japanese intriguers. Reform was largely checked, for it was not to the interest of either side that Korea should have decent government. The King assumed the title of Emperor. The promise of his earlier days was not fulfilled, and his nerve was broken by the murder of his wife. Weak, cunning and full of tricks, he tried the game of playing off one side against another. He thought to secure his independence by treaties. America was bound in the most solemn manner to come to Korea's aid. England and Japan had pledged one another that they "mutually recognised the independence of Korea" and were "entirely uninfluenced by aggressive tendencies there." The Emperor had yet to learn that written bonds count for nothing when not backed up by national efficiency.

When Japan commenced war against Russia, her two main reasons were officially given as the safeguarding of the independence of Korea and the maintenance of the "open door." The Japanese land campaign opened on Korean soil, and solemn promises were made "in a spirit of firm friendship" to ensure "the safety and repose of the Imperial House," and "definitely to guarantee the independence and territorial integrity" of Korea. Japanese troops came in by the ten thousand, and Japanese settlers by the score of thousand. Japanese victories in Manchuria were followed by greater claims and a more domineering attitude. It soon became clear that Japan had decided on the destruction of Korean national existence. In November, 1905, the palace was surrounded by Japanese troops, and the ministers were forced to sign a treaty surrendering their external independence. The Emperor protested, and has since repeatedly declared that he never consented to this step. He attempted to appeal to the Powers, and, finally, as the outcome of a somewhat blundering effort to ask aid from The Hague Conference, he was turned off the throne and his semi-idiot son put in his place. Japan then took the final formal steps to legalise her complete absorption of the various branches of internal administration.

Japan is not the only nation that has acquired fresh territory by trickery; and were the sole complaint against her the fact that she has

taken over Korea by duplicity, perjury and cunning, little more would be heard of the matter. The gravamen of the charge against Japan is not the manner in which she acquired Korea, but the way in which she has treated the common people there since the war. Were the matter at issue merely the substitution of the inefficient administration of Yi-heung for capable Japanese rule, few would protest. The real complaint is, not that Japan broke her repeated and solemn promises to a weaker race, but that, seizing power, she has used it unjustly and cruelly.

The Japanese administration of Korea can be divided into two parts, the first the period under Mr (now Baron) Hayashi, 1904-5, and the second, under Prince Ito, since the beginning of 1906. The Japanese began well. Their troops were kept in hand, Korean coolies employed in the transport service were fairly paid, and it seemed as though Japan was going to repeat her splendid behaviour in Manchuria and Korea during the Chinese War. The first trouble occurred over the conduct of the many Japanese coolies who landed in Korea. These arrived by the ship-load, thousands coming each week. Most of the coolies had no money, and they were drawn from the lowest and roughest classes in Japan. They spread over the land, robbing, murdering and outraging. The Korean magistrates did not dare to interfere with them, and the few Japanese consuls and residents had neither time nor inclination to do so. The Korean complainant who attempted to reach a Japanese resident was usually thrown out by underlings in the outer courts. Those who secured admission found themselves before judges who knew nothing of their language, and were at the mercy of rascally interpreters. It soon became a common-place that no Korean could obtain justice from the Japanese. I myself came across many cases of the grossest injustice, and every white man of my acquaintance in Korea at that time knew many more. I take it that the most uncompromising defender of Japanese policy will not attempt to dispute the existence of this reign of disorder. Even strenuous advocates of Japan like Mr. George Kennan have admitted and deplored it.

I may be asked what form these outrages took. Korean property, land, farm produce, fishing rights, etc., were stolen wholesale by Japanese coolies, and the Koreans themselves were beaten and abused. In some cases Koreans were turned out of their homes by force by coolies who took a fancy to them; in others, Koreans were turned off their fishing grounds and killed for protesting. Soldiers would nearly kill natives on the slightest provocation. Every private was a summary court of justice, inflicting what punishment he pleased. The favourite form of punishment was to knock a man down by a heavy blow in the stomach with the butt-end of a rifle, and then to jump on his body, hold him down with one foot, keep him taut by grabbing his top-knot, and kick him, punch him, and hammer him with the butt

end of the rifle at pleasure. Of course the man treated in this fashion often crept away afterwards, and died in agony.

If such outrages had been isolated, or stood alone, it would be a mistake to attach overwhelming importance to them, for it might be reasonably argued that they were merely the temporary results of a time of transition. But what was much more serious was the obvious intention of the Japanese authorities to use every means in their power to destroy Korean individuality, and to transfer the ownership of land as much as possible, and by any means, into Japanese hands. The names of the towns were altered to Japanese names, a stupid and irritating measure. Tokyo time was employed by the Japanese officials in place of Seoul time. An amazing scheme of land appropriation was put forward, in the summer of 1904, under the cloak of the name of a Mr. Nagamori, a hitherto unknown son of Nippon. All the waste lands of Korea—in other words the greater part of the Empire, and all the unworked minerals—were to be handed over to him, without payment and practically in perpetuity. This scheme was stubbornly advanced by the Japanese Acting-minister, Mr. Hagiwara; but it excited such resentment among both Koreans and foreigners that it had to be withdrawn. Large areas of the best land of the country were seized by the Army, under the plea of military necessity. Trivial amounts were paid to the Korean ministry as compensation, and the owners of the land usually received nothing. The areas thus seized were the finest and richest sites in Korea. The "military necessity" turned out in the end to mean, in many cases, the necessity of finding homes for Japanese civilian settlers.

While the Japanese were everywhere seizing property, with or without a show of legality, they suffered some of the worst of the old administrative abuses to continue unchecked. Even during the summer of 1906, when I travelled in the north, I found torture going on in prisons in towns where the Japanese were in full control. In Ping-yang, the second city of the Empire, I saw a number of men and one woman all confined together in one cell, serving long sentences, more than half starved, and in the most horrible state of filth, emaciation and neglect. In Sun-chon I found men tied flat on the ground in the black hole of the prison, and kept there for days without moving, with flesh gangrened where the ropes had cut into it, with bodies broken, and in one case with eyes beaten out. But one was mainly impressed, not so much by peculiarly atrocious cases of torture and abuse, as by the almost universal tyranny and cruelty.

This policy could not and did not fail to have a tremendous effect on public opinion. It alienated the great mass of Europeans and Americans in Korea, and made them critics where they had formerly been sympathisers with Japan. At first there had been a body of Koreans willing to work with the Japanese. The Court party was, of

course, uncompromisingly hostile, but a considerable group of young reformers were friendly, and many of the small farmers would have welcomed decent administration, under whatever name it came. These men were driven into opposition.

When Prince (then Marquis) Ito was appointed Resident General at the beginning of 1906, it seemed that a better day had arrived. The high character, the statecraft and the political sagacity of the real maker of modern Japan encouraged the hope that an era of conciliation and justice would succeed the former time. Prince Ito threw himself into his work with the greatest energy, and soon won golden opinions from all. Among his immediate personal assistants are men like Mr. Megata and Mr. Zumoto, the finest type of administrators that Japan has yet produced. So far as Prince Ito's work can be removed from the abuses of the administration, few have anything but hearty praise for it. That he sincerely desires to bring peace and justice to Korea is the undoubted belief of all, myself included, who have come in contact with him.

Prince Ito early gave earnest of his good intention, and by the end of 1906 certain decided benefits of his rule were apparent. The Japanese military gendarmerie were largely cleared away, and civil police put in their place. The gendarmerie have won a very bad reputation, both in Korea and Manchuria, for their harshness and often for their cruelty. Of the civil police in the villages I hear much better accounts, and on the whole they seem to behave with kindness and fairness. A number of the worst of the Japanese coolies were expelled. The course of justice was improved. Consideration is now promised for the financial claims of the old Korean landowners robbed of their homes. Under the Hayashi administration a much-needed and beneficial reform of the currency had been effected. This was followed by other practical, useful improvements.

If this were all, the tale could be closed with a formal regret over the troubles at the beginning, and a pious wish for the continuation of the good work of Prince Ito. Unfortunately, it is not all. The effectiveness of the Resident General's work has been greatly hampered by the impossibility of securing a sufficient number of capable assistants from Japan. The policy of the administration is to place Japanese everywhere, save in a few places where Korean durfums are useful. Now the average Japanese, of above the coolie class, is most unwilling to remain long in Korea, and in many cases refuses to go there at all. The same man who is eager to live in poverty in England and America for a few years, refuses to spend a few months with good pay in Korea. Many a time have my Japanese official friends told me pathetically of their longings for home. The very clerk in the post office would ask when I had last been in Japan and what I

thought it looked like. "Has there been much change? I wish I "were back there."

This sentimental feeling undoubtedly aggravates Prince Ito's difficulties. A few of his immediate followers, men schooled in his methods, have rallied round him and stuck to him, although they do not conceal their desire, in some cases, to return to their fatherland. But the average Japanese official in Korea is of an inferior type to those you find in Japan. The good intentions of the men at the head often still become transformed into harsh injustice by the time they reach local officials.

A second difficulty is that the Japanese have plainly, if not openly, resolved to destroy in time every trace of Korean nationality, besides Korean independence. Not many weeks since I frankly discussed this point with one of the most influential of the Japanese in Korea. "You must understand that I am not expressing official views," he told me. "But if you ask me as an individual what is to be the "outcome of our policy, I can only see one end. This is an end which "will take several generations, but it must come. The Korean people "will be absorbed in the Japanese. They will talk our language, live "our life, and be an integral part of us. There are only two ways of "colonial administration. One is to rule over the people as aliens. "This you England have done in India, and, therefore, your Indian "Empire cannot endure. India must pass out of your rule. The "second way is to absorb the people. This is what we will do, and "it is towards this end that our energies must be directed. We must "teach them our language, establish our institutions, and make them "one with us." That is the benevolent Japanese idea; the cruder idea, more commonly entertained, is to absorb the Korean lands, place all the industry of the country in Japanese hands, and reduce the natives to the place of hewers of wood and drawers of water for their triumphant conquerors. The Japanese believes that the Korean is on a wholly different level to himself, a coward, a weakling, and a poltroon. He despises him, and treats him accordingly.

The greatest hindrance to the effectiveness of Prince Ito's policy of conciliation has been the disputes and friction between the civilian and the military sides of the Japanese administration. The Army, under General Hasegawa, advocates sternness and repression. The civil branch is apparently quite unable to control it. Within the past few months it has shown to what extremes it is prepared to go. It has been carrying out one of the most cruel and odious campaigns ever conducted in this generation in the name of civilisation. When I left Korea late in September, I was the only white man who had visited the scenes of this campaign; so a few facts about what I saw may not be without interest.

When the old Emperor was turned off the throne, in the summer of 1907, the Army was disbanded, and a number of the native soldiers,

together with young men from Seoul, boys of fourteen and sixteen, and old tiger hunters from the hills, declared a holy war against the Japanese. They had very few arms, save the most primitive type of muzzle-loading guns, and they had very little ammunition. Nevertheless they gave the Japanese great trouble, and kept a large area to the south-east of Seoul in a ferment. The Japanese found it necessary to despatch considerable numbers of troops against them. When I proposed to visit the scene of operations last autumn, the officials of the Residency General promptly objected. They refused to grant me a passport, and when I declared my intention of travelling without one I was politely informed that I should be liable to arrest and imprisonment at any point of my journey. However, by a simple device I was able to penetrate the rebel districts before the authorities knew that I had left the capital. I made a circular tour through one stretch of fighting territory. Save for an unfortunate trick the Korean irregulars had of potting at me with their old guns, under the impression that I was a Japanese, I finished my journey without much difficulty. I am bound to say that the irregulars always apologised in the most handsome fashion when they discovered their mistake.

It is not my purpose here to tell the full story of that tour, but simply to relate something of what I saw of the administrative methods of the Army. I soon ceased to wonder that the Residency General had endeavoured to stop my journey. I passed through scores of villages completely destroyed by the Japanese Army, with not a house, not a wall, not a jar of food left. At one place, Chee-chong, a considerable town, not a house remained save the yamen of the magistrate. On every side I heard stories of women outraged, wounded, bayonnetted, and of non-combatants and children shot. The villagers and townspeople thus attacked were not rebels, but the rebels had fought near their homes and that was enough. They were nothing more than simple farmers and their families, peaceful and law-abiding. The Japanese military authorities had thought it necessary, to quote the words of one of them, to show the people "the strong arm of Japan." In one small area I passed through the former settlements of about twenty thousand people, made homeless, all their food supplies gone, and now waiting on the bare hill-sides to perish from hunger and cold in the coming winter.

The case of one village may serve to tell of what I found in many. From a mountain pass looking down on the valley leading to I-Chon I could see in front of me village after village reduced to ashes. I rode on to the nearest heap of ruins. The place had been the home of quite a large village, with about seventy or eighty houses. Destruction, thorough and complete, had fallen upon it. Homes, food and furniture had all been burned.

The villagers had come back to the ruins again, and had put up

temporary refuges of straw for their women folk, while attempting to re-build. The young men were out on the hills cutting down trees, and the elders were at work in the village. The fields were rich with well-cultivated crops, ready for harvest, but there was no time to gather them in, for shelter was the first necessity.

I sat down under a tree, glad of the shade, and the village elders came round me. One point struck me at once. The Korean woman is usually shy, retiring, and afraid to open her mouth in the presence of a stranger. Here the women spoke up as freely as the men. The people all seemed to be simple and kindly villagers. Anyone could see that they were not fighting men.

"We are glad," they said, "that a European man has come to learn what has befallen us. We hope you will tell your people, so that all men may know. There had been some fighting on the hills beyond our village, and the Eui-pyung (the Korean rebels) broke some telegraph poles there. The Eui-pyung had nothing to do with us. They came down from the eastern hills, and were not our men. But after the Eui-pyung fell back the Japanese soldiers marched to our village, and to seven other villages around. Look, and you can see the ruins of them all. They spoke many harsh words to us. The Eui-pyung broke down the telegraph poles, and you did not stop them," they said. "Therefore you are the same as the Eui-pyung. Why have you eyes if you do not watch? Why have you strength if you do not prevent the Eui-pyung from doing mischief? The Eui-pyung came to your houses and you fed them. Therefore you are all the same as they, and we will punish you."

"They went from house to house, taking what they wanted, and setting all the rest alight. One old man—he had lived in his house since his mother bore him—saw a soldier lighting his home. He fell on his knees and caught the feet of the soldier. 'Excuse me, excuse me,' he said, with many tears. 'Please do not burn my house. Leave it for me that I may die there. I am an old man.' The soldier tried to shake him off, but the old man prayed the more, and clung more closely. Then the soldier raised his gun and shot the old man, and we buried him in the hills.

"One who was near to her hour of child-birth was lying in a house. Alas for her! One of our young men was in the fields cutting grass. He had not noticed the soldiers come. He lifted his knife and was sharpening it against a stone. It shone in the sun, and a soldier saw it, and was much afraid. 'There is a Eui-pyung,' he said, and he fired and killed the man. Another of our people, seeing the fire, noticed that all his family papers were burning. What is one without family papers but a nameless wanderer? The man rushed in to pull out his papers, and a soldier shot him."

I rode from that village with a heavy heart. I saw many like it afterwards. From other parts of the country well-verified stories

have come to me, showing that the Japanese army has during the past few months attempted to wipe out a countryside. Can anyone wonder that the Korean people scoff at the good words and fair promises of Prince Ito? "The Japanese have resolved to make an "end of us altogether," they say.

Had space permitted, I would fain have told of the effects of Japanese supremacy on British interests in Korea. I would have told, too, of the recent amazing prosecution of a British journalist in Seoul, Mr. Bethell, for publishing details of some of the recent massacres. Mr. Bethell was convicted and muzzled, on the ground that he was "disturbing the peace." The only peace to disturb in those parts is the peace of desolation and of death. It is in vain to-day for the Japanese to think that they can muzzle the Press or keep back news. It yet remains to be seen if the saner and more politic party in Japan will not call halt to a plan of campaign that cannot fail to bring discredit on their national honour. The time has gone by when permanent Empire could be built up on a foundation of bayonets.

F. A. MCKENZIE

POETRY AND SYMBOLISM: A STUDY OF "THE TEMPEST."

I HAD once a long and interesting conversation with Browning on a subject of which he was always slow to speak, his own poetry. In the course of it I remarked that the great difficulty of people who were not poets themselves and had no touch of inspiration, but who were yet capable of enthusiastically appreciating poetry, was to know when and to what extent it was to be regarded as symbolic. "May I," I continued, "take an illustration, 'the readiest that occurs to me, from one of your own poems.'" "Certainly," he replied. "I will take *Hugues of Saxe-Gotha*." The scene of the poem, it will be remembered, is an organ-loft at night; the organist, with his candle "burnt to its uttermost inch" and on the point of flickering out, is passionately imploring the spirit of Hugues not to let him depart without revealing to him the meaning of a certain "mountainous fugue," his masterpiece. The composition, so far as the poor organist can discern, and it has long been "taxing his fingers," is chaos incarnate, and yet he knows that, sure as there is gold under the church-roof's cobwebs and "Truth and 'Nature' over 'life's zigzags and dodges,'" the fugue has divine meaning.

Sure you said, "Good, the mere notes,
Still could'st thou take my intent,
Know what procured me our company's votes,
A master were lauded and sciolists shent,
Parted the sheep from the goats."

* * * * *

Is it your moral of life?
Such a web, simple and subtle,
Weave we on earth here in impotent strife,
Backward and forward each throwing his shuttle,
Death ending all with a knife?

Then, with mingled illustrations of the intricacies he cannot unravel

and expressions of his continued belief and faith in his maddeningly perplexing master, he continues—

Friend, your fugue taxes the finger,
Learning it once who would lose it?
Yet all the while a misgiving will linger,
Truth's golden o'er us, although we refuse it,
Nature through cobwebs we string her.

Hugues! I advise *moderato*
(Counterpoint glares like a Gorgon),
Bid One, Two, Three, Four, Five, clear the arena!
Say the word straight I unstop the full organ,
Blare out the *mode Palestrina*:
While in the roof, if I'm right there,
Lo you, the wick in the socket!

"Well, what do you make of that?" he said. "Can I doubt," I replied, "with the light of your *Pisgah Sights* to guide one, that it is, 'at any rate partly, an allegory: that the fugue is life, Hugues what Sir Thomas Browne calls the first great composer, the student of the 'fugue the man who believes in the harmony and wisdom implicit in 'the scheme of things, though, try how he may, he cannot discern 'them, but who, as his candle is flickering out, is beginning, like Coleridge in his latter days, to find things 'wonderfully clearing and 'harmonising,' though, alas, his candle is out before the full truth is 'revealed to him. Now, making all allowance for what cannot of course be pressed into the service of symbolism and belongs entirely 'to the framework and picturesque and realistic parts of the poem, 'that goes on all fours with what you have directly expressed in '*Pisgah Sights*.' Browning burst out laughing, and said, "That is 'one of the most ingenious things I ever heard, but I can assure you 'that when I wrote that poem I had not the remotest intention of 'attaching any such meaning to it. The poem was little more than 'an actual description of what I saw with my own eyes. I happened 'one evening to stroll into a church"—(I think he said it was at Antwerp)—"and I made my way, I remember, to the organ-loft, 'where, though the service was over and the lights were being put 'out, the organ was still playing, and I looked down into the fast-emptying and fast-darkening church. I was struck with the 'picturesqueness of the scene and thought I would describe it in a 'poem. There began and ended the inspiration of the little trifle into 'which you have read so much." But I refused to be convinced. I did not venture to say that he had introduced into the poem what he had not seen on that occasion, as was obviously the fact, and that what he had thus introduced, this and the ideas radiating from it were after all its real theme; but I did venture to suggest that the construction which had been put upon it at any rate lent it an additional interest. This he smilingly

admitted: so, taking courage, I asked him if he thought the famous passage in Plato's *Apology* about the unconscious inspiration of poets should be taken seriously; whether it was really true that, given genuine inspiration, a poet was so unconscious of the full meaning of what he expressed that, as Plato puts it, anyone you please could give a better explanation of what poets in their inspiration mean than the poets themselves could give. With some reservation, and making of course much allowance for the exaggerated way in which it was stated, this he said was undoubtedly and profoundly true. It was an easy transition from this to the question of how far allegory, consciously or unconsciously, inspires, sometimes colours and sometimes, though unperceived or ignored, even saturates poetry. On this he had many interesting things to say, particularly, I remember, about the *Odyssey* and the *Æneid*.

The severance of poetry from its higher and nobler energies and functions on the part of those who at present represent it, and the corresponding indifference of modern critics to all that constitutes its real seriousness and importance, have created an atmosphere chilling indeed to any attempt at what may be called an esoteric interpretation of it. Poetry, we are told, ceases to be poetry the moment it ceases to be art, art being in its turn the expression of the beautiful in beautiful forms and nothing more; with the spiritual and with the moral its association is purely accidental and always perilous. Allegory one of our leading critics has pronounced to be the dry rot of poetry where in poetry it is obvious, and the discovery or the attempted discovery of it when latent the dry rot of criticism. Now, it may be at once conceded that the discovery of allegory and symbolism in poetry where it is not studiously introduced and superficially apparent, as in the *Odyssey*, the *Faerie Queen* and Tennyson's *Idylls*, is the most delicate and perilous of investigations; nay, even in these works it is a matter of the greatest difficulty to distinguish between what is to be taken literally and what symbolically. In the *Odyssey*, for example, we may be in no doubt about such incidents as Horace takes as implying allegory, but are we justified in going further? Are we to suppose that in the Moly given by Hermes to Ulysses as a prophylactic against the charms of Circe we are to understand that education and philosophy enable a philosopher to indulge in sensuality because he will never run into excess? that the fact that Ulysses' mariners are represented as being taller, stouter and handsomer after their transformation from swine into human beings again symbolises that men by gaining experience profit even from vicious pleasures? that Scylla and Charybdis represent the extremes on each side of the Mean, and that in the history of the suitors persisting as they do, in spite of repeated warnings from man and from heaven, in their follies and sins, till hardened and infatuated they fall, ripe for destruction, on their terrible doom, we are to see

what every day witnesses among mankind and what Bunyan has depicted in similar detail, psychologically at least, and with equal power, in the awful drama embodied in his *History of Mr. Badman*? Where are we to stop? The moment we give the reins to fancy it is as easy to make a poem, especially if it be a narrative poem or a drama, symbolise pretty much what we will as it is to mould out of the floating clouds or burning coals fantastic forms. There are literally no limits to such absurdities, and they have been the scorn of sober people in all ages. We know how the early allegorists in ancient Greece as well as some of the Alexandrian critics make themselves and the Homeric poems ridiculous by these glosses, how the *Divine Comedy* has by the elder Rossetti and other commentators of the same order been made the subject of similar follies. We remember Swift's inimitable pleasantry directed against those who discovered the whole scheme of the Metempsychosis in *Tom Thumb* and fountains of immense erudition in *Tommy Potts* and the *Wise Men of Gotham*. Nowhere is the humour of Lucian, of Rabelais, and of our own eighteenth century satirists so rich and droll as in their parodies and exposures of these inanities.

But the abuse of a particular method of interpretation is no argument against its proper application. The charm of all poetry, even æsthetically, depends far more on what it suggests than on what it directly expresses, on what it enfolds than on what it expands. This is the element in it which evades analysis and, like the principle of life, reveals itself only in its effects. To the ethic of poetry symbolism and allegory stand often in the same relation, apparent but undefinable, pervasive but unfixed; reduce them to precision and they at once assume undue proportions and usurp a place which does not belong to them. In his remarkable analysis of three of his Canzoni in the *Convito* Dante tells us that they and all serious poetry are to be interpreted in four senses: first, in a literal sense, that is in accordance with what the words simply and directly convey; secondly, in an allegorical sense, with reference that is to say to what they veil and mantle, truth in the garb of fiction; thirdly, in a moral sense, that is with reference to what is and what was designed to be ethically instructive; and lastly in an anagogic sense, that is with reference to what is of metaphysical significance,—to what is concerned and linked with the divine and spiritual. We smile at such an analysis now, and shudder at what would be likely to be the results of its application generally to poetry, for of the results of its application to Dante's own poetry criticism has long had dismal experience, witness such portents as Gabrielle Rossetti's *Comento Analitico*. And yet, if not too rigidly applied and applied with tact, balance, and insight, enlightened and directed by close, exact and sympathetic study of the text of a great poem—for to great poetry only will it apply—who could doubt that many a fruitful secret would be revealed of which not even a whisper reaches the common ear?

The last thing that modern criticism seems to regard is the importance of discrimination in judging poets and poetry. In the first place it does not seem to recognise that the distinction between poetry of the first order and poetry of the secondary and third orders is not a difference in degree, but a difference in kind. And poetry of the first order is essentially didactic, an appeal through the senses to the spiritual and moral nature of man. It is so with the Homeric poems, it is so with Pindar, with Æschylus and with Sophocles, with Virgil and Dante, with Spenser and Shakespeare, with Milton, with Goethe and with Wordsworth. To say that it is in symbolism, or in the more elaborate expression of symbolism, allegory, that these poets or at least the majority of them embody their highest wisdom, their deepest truths, and habitually wrap what is most precious and furthering in their teaching and in their message, is to say what probably no one but second-rate modern critics would dispute. Some of the noblest works in poetry are professedly allegories. How largely the ancients supposed allegory to enter into the *Odyssey* may be judged by the fact that it was described by a Greek critic as "a mirror of life," and it would not, perhaps, be too much to say that as an allegory it was almost as much to the ancient Greeks as the *Pilgrim's Progress* has been to Protestant England. The sublimest of the Greek dramas, the *Prometheus*, is an allegory. The central and chief book of the *Æneid* is an elaborate allegory. The *Divine Comedy* is pure allegory. So is the *Faerie Queene*, so largely is *Paradise Lost*, so wholly is *Comus*. Allegory suffuses the two parts of Goethe's *Faust*. The most pathetic of Shelley's poems, *Alastor*, is an allegory, so also is his masterpiece, the *Prometheus Unbound*. What is best in Tennyson's Idylls and what redeems them from mediocrity is the allegorical significance with which they are invested. Subtract from *Gareth and Lynette*, from *Balin and Balan*, from the *Last Tournament*, from the *Coming and Passing of Arthur*, and, above all, from the *Holy Grail*, their allegorical significance and what do you leave them? Precisely what we find in the other Idylls, much falsetto, much commonplace, and nothing in their very real beauties entitling them to a higher rank than *Enoch Arden* and *Aylmer's Field*. True of course it is that in the case of the *Odyssey*, the *Prometheus*, the *Divine Comedy*, and of every one of the poems and dramas referred to the subtraction of allegory leaves them all that constitutes their charm and their power as pure poetry. As they appeal to the senses and the affections, as they appeal to the sensuous imagination and to fancy, as they appeal in fine to all that in our nature responds directly to æsthetic impression, their power on us is in no way affected. In fact everything that they present and suggest simply and immediately has, or may have, full force, not æsthetically merely, but spiritually and morally. As a rule, however, we are most sensible of what appeals to us æsthetically, and satisfied with that exquisite

pleasure regard with comparative indifference everything else. It is not surprising, therefore, that if lovers of poetry have, perhaps as a rule, so little interest in what is exoteric and obvious, they should have so little curiosity about what is more or less esoteric and veiled. And yet, let it be emphasised, truism though it be, that of all great poetry the note is *meliora latent*, better than the seen lies hid, and its hiding-place is in symbolism and allegory.

The relation of allegory to epic poetry cannot perhaps be explained better than Tasso explains it in one of his letters to Scipio Gonzaga. When he began his poem the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, he had, he said, not the smallest idea of an allegory, as it seemed a superfluity, "because every interpreter creates an allegory according to his own caprice, and because there have never been wanting to good poets critics who would furnish allegories in abundance." In Homer and Virgil he goes on to say it can be discerned only in particular places, and he quotes with great approval a passage in which Saint Augustin deals with the question: "*Non omnia quæ in figuris finguntur significare aliquid putanda sunt: multa enim propter illa quæ significant, ordinis et-connexionis gratiâ, adjuncta sunt. Solo vomere terra proscinditur, sed ut hoc fieri possit cætera quoque huic aratri membra junguntur*"—that is—we are not to suppose that everything in figurative fiction is significant, for many things are adjoined on account of those which are significant, from considerations of order and connection. It is the ploughshare only which breaks up the earth, but that this end may be attained all the other parts of the plough are joined to it.

Thus, while Tasso owns that the poem was not designed to be an allegory, he owns also that, as in the case of the Homeric poems and the *Æneid*, allegory entered essentially into its composition, as indeed it obviously does. It is from not distinguishing the ploughshare from those parts of the plough which were framed simply for the purpose of enabling the ploughshare to do its work that allegorical interpretation goes astray; and this is the source of half the absurdities which turn what might be the most fruitful and interesting of all methods of study into something little better than buffoonery. With the remarks of Tasso may be compared some remarks which Tennyson made with reference to the allegory in the *Idylls*. He complains that some of his critics had "taken his hobby and ridden it too hard, and had explained some things too allegorically, although there is an allegorical or perhaps rather a parabolic drift in the poem." "Camelot, for instance," he went on to say, "a city of shadowy palaces is everywhere symbolic of the gradual growth of human beliefs and institutions, and of the spiritual development of man. And yet for all that there was no single fact or incident in the poem which could not be explained as without any mystery or allegory whatever." On being once asked by a curious bishop whether

those who interpreted the three Queens who accompanied Arthur on his last voyage as Faith, Hope and Charity were right, he replied that they "were right and not right; they mean that and "they do not," adding that he "hated to be tied down to say *this* "means *that* because the thought within the image is much more than "any one interpretation." And very happily on another occasion he observed: "Poetry is like shot-silk with many glancing colours. Every "reader must find his own interpretation according to his ability and "according to his sympathy with the poet." To the same effect spoke Goethe: "They come and ask me what idea I meant to embody in "my *Faust*, as if I knew myself, and could inform them: from heaven "through the world to hell would indeed be something, but this is no "idea, only a course of action. It was not," he continued, "my "business as a poet to strive to embody anything abstract. I received "in my mind impressions, and those of a sensual, animated, charming, "varied, hundredfold kind, just as a lively imagination presented "them, and I had, as a poet, nothing more to do than artistically to "round off and elaborate such views and impressions, and by means "of a lively representation so to bring them forward that others might "receive the same impression in hearing or reading my representation "of them." Such is the only light which poets themselves throw, or perhaps can throw, on a question which must always have so much fascination for all who take poetry seriously.

But if the difficulty of unravelling allegory, where allegory is intended and professed, as in the case of the *Divine Comedy*, the *Faerie Queene* and the Idylls of which Tennyson spoke be great, the difficulty of interpreting symbolism in its less express forms is very much greater. For it is in symbolism that a poet's genius, under the impulse of inspiration, works most unconsciously; in symbolism that he expresses what has never even for himself assumed definition; through symbolism that he presents half-veiled and in half-lights what from various motives he would not display unveiled and in full light; to symbolism that he commits his secrets. It follows, then, that in the interpretation or rather attempted interpretation of symbolism in poetry, any insistence on precision and certainty, especially in relation to details, would be as presumptuous as it would be absurd.

The most interesting of the many interesting forms which symbolism assumes among poets is where they employ it consciously and perhaps at the same time half-unconsciously, too, as a means, for their own relief, of self-portraiture and self-revelation, as Shelley undoubtedly does in *Alastor*, as Milton obviously does in *Samson Agonistes*, and as Shakespeare, I venture to think, does in *The Tempest*. And this brings me to my main object, namely, an attempt to show that both Shakespeare and Milton have each left us in easily deciphered symbol, as their last legacy, an inexpressibly pathetic picture of themselves in their latter days and when their

work was done, and their final message or rather gospel to the world.

In dealing with the symbolism of *Samson Agonistes* we are surely treading on very firm ground, with such studied particularity has Milton pictured himself in Samson; with so little disguise has he expressed in the Choruses all that the spectacle of the world of the Restoration and the contemplation of the tragedy of his own later years had suggested and inspired. There he sate among the ruins of his earthly life and his earthly hopes—

Eyeless in Gaza at the mill with slaves.

Desolate also and companionless, and by a sad and strange irony, so at least he seems to have interpreted it, tortured by a disease which is usually the result of sensuality and intemperance. The great men on whom his hopes had rested, and who had been his coadjutors in doing what both he and they believed to be God's work, either judicially murdered or exiled, or, if dead, dragged out of their graves to be publicly gibbeted. There is no need to quote the Chorus in which all this is with such pathetic eloquence expressed, but the latter part may be given. After expressing their perplexity at the way Providence allows the noblest of his servants to perish in ignominy and shame, the Chorus continues:—

Not only dost degrade them, or remit
To life obscur'd, which were a fair dismission,
But throws't them lower than thou didst exalt them high;
Unseemly falls in human eye,
Too grievous for the trespass or omission;
Oft leav'st them to the hostile sword
Of heathen and profane, their carcasses
To dogs and fowls a prey, or else captiv'd;
Or to the unjust tribunals, under change of times,
And condemnation of the ingrateful multitude.
If these they scape, perhaps in poverty
With sickness and disease thou bow'st them down,
Painful diseases and deform'd,
In crude old age:
Though not disordinate, yet causeless suff'ring
The punishment of dissolute days; in fine,
Just or unjust, alike seem miserable,
For oft alike both come to evil end.

It is not necessary to pursue these analogies in detail through the drama, but there can be little doubt that in Dalila he drew the portrait of that wife who, in disillusioning him of his romantic ideals, had taught him his first bitter lesson in life, and whose disobedience, so insulting to his pride, he may have forgiven, but most certainly never forgot. How majestic, yet how piercing is the pathos where Samson replies to his father's words—they might have been and in substance

no doubt would have been, could he have addressed his son, the words of Milton's own pious and kindly father, now a far-off memory,—

Manoa—His might continues in thee not for naught,
Nor shall his wondrous gifts be frustrate thus.
Samson—All otherwise to me my thoughts portend,
That these dark orbs no more shall treat with light,
Nor th' other light of life continue long,
But yield to double darkness, nigh at hand :
So much I feel my genial spirits droop,
My hopes all flat, Nature within me seems
In all her functions weary of herself,
My race of glory run, and race of shame,
And I shall shortly be with them that rest.

And when these words were written—they and the drama of which they are a part—Milton's work was done, and within less than three years, quite broken and worn out, he was "with them that rest." But was this the last word, this the end and sum of all?—perplexity, weariness, despondency. Assuredly not. The last word was what finds expression in :—

Patience is more oft the exercise
Of saints, the trial of their fortitude,
Making them each his own deliverer,
And victor over all
That tyranny or fortune can inflict.

and in

All is best, though we oft doubt,
What th' unsearchable dispose
Of highest Wisdom brings about,
And ever best found in the close.
Oft He seems to hide His face,
But unexpectedly returns.

So intimately, then, does Milton under the thinnest of veils, converse with us, not merely as an artist, but as a man. And would anyone say that if the symbolism of the drama were ignored and it were regarded merely as a work of art, it would not be deprived of at least half its charm and half its interest and pathos, because it would lose in the power of its sincerity and it would appeal less to human sympathy.

Has *The Tempest* the same autobiographical interest? This is a much more difficult question, and in discussing it we must carefully bear in mind all that has been remarked generally about the difficulties in unravelling allegory and symbolism in poetry, the danger of too rigid definition, the confusion of the plough framework with the share, the necessary subordination of any allegorical purpose, especially in a drama, to the requirements of dramatic art, the "glancing colours" of which Tennyson speaks, and all the other perils

involved in such investigations. But let me boldly propound my thesis, first that, as Milton in *Samson*, so Shakespeare in *Prospero* depicted himself in the last stage of his career when his work likewise was done and he had practically taken his leave of life; and, secondly, that in *The Tempest* generally, through an allegorical presentation of the world and of mankind, he summed up his final philosophy and delivered his final gospel.

The date of *The Tempest* cannot be fixed with certainty, but everything points to the probability, and probability in the highest degree, that it was the very last play Shakespeare wrote. It was beyond all doubt suggested by a narrative recorded in two tracts, one entitled *A Discovery of the Bermudas, otherwise called the Isle of Devils*, written by Silvester Jourdan, and *A True Declaration of the Estate of the Colonie in Virginia*, published respectively in the summer and autumn of 1610, and still more vividly in a letter addressed in the same year by one William Strachey to a lady of title in England, reprinted some years later in *Purchas his Pilgrimes*. In April, 1612, a ship, the "Plough," sailed from the Thames with adventurers for the Bermudas, and in consequence probably of the public interest taken in this expedition Jourdan's tract was in 1613 re-issued under the title of *A Plaine Description of the Bermudas, now called Summer Islands*. It is worth noticing that Strachey, who had been an eye-witness of what these narratives describe, was in 1612 living in Black Friars, and it has been conjectured that Shakespeare may have heard from him the particulars which he has used in the play. In any case, between the summer of 1610 and the early part of 1613 the Bermudas and the adventures of their explorers were prominently before the public, and most prominently in 1612 when the "Plough" sailed from the Thames. A comparison of the narratives with the incidents used by Shakespeare makes it all but certain that he got some touches from Strachey, whose letter, being as it was unprinted, he could not have seen unless Strachey or some one else had showed it to him; failing that the inference of course is that Strachey had himself communicated with him. It is, moreover, just as likely that he read Jourdan's narrative, not in its original form, but in the reprint of 1613. While therefore it is certain that *The Tempest* could not have been written before the summer of 1610, it is, so far as its relation to these narratives goes, in a high degree probable that it was written much later, possibly in 1612, possibly even in 1613. And this late date is corroborated by other evidence. We know from the Vertue MSS. that it was acted with other plays in the spring of 1613 at the festivities held on the occasion of the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine of the Rhine, and this is the first notice we have of its existence. If it was written for that occasion and then first appeared, the question would be settled; it would belong to a date at least a year and a half later than that recorded of any other of his plays, and beyond which nothing, with

the possible exception of a recension and completion of *Henry VIII.*, is known to have come from his pen; it would have been written subsequently to his leaving London and when, beyond all doubt, he was living in retirement at Stratford-on-Avon. But the evidence for its being a new play when exhibited, as undoubtedly it was, at the marriage festivities in February, 1613, is unfortunately not conclusive. It has been pointed out that in the entry in the Vertue Manuscripts there is no intimation that it was a new play, and that it is merely one in a list of fourteen others, including three if not four of Shakespeare's other plays which were certainly not then acted for the first time. The question cannot be argued here, but, allowing full weight to what may be legitimately inferred from its inclusion among plays undoubtedly not new, it still remains that had it been new there would, in the documents referred to, have been no intimation of the fact. The stress laid in the play itself on what would have been appropriate to such an occasion as the marriage festivities in the spring of 1613, namely, the event on which the plot of the play turns, the marriage of a foreign prince with an island princess who has never left her home, and the introduction of the two hymeneal masques, the unmistakable reference in the first scene of the fifth act to the recent death of Prince Henry, with many other particulars and touches which must be obvious to everyone and which have been urged with so much force by the late Dr. Richard Garnet in his well-known article in the "Universal Review" and elsewhere, surely outweigh any ambiguity in the testimony afforded by the Vertue Manuscripts. And this is certain, that while there is no evidence of the existence of the play before the spring of 1613, it was suggested by narratives and is full of allusions to events most prominently before the public about that time, including perhaps what may have suggested its title, the tempests prevalent in the autumn and early winter of 1612, of which Stowe gives such a vivid description. Nor must we omit to put also into the scale Ben Jonson's sarcastic allusion to it in the *Induction* to *Bartholomew Fair*, which appeared in 1614—an allusion which would lose half its point and pertinence had the audience not been recently familiar with what is so ill-naturedly glanced at.

There is, therefore, very good reason for supposing that *The Tempest* was the last entire play that came from Shakespeare's pen, that in it he took, though he had still three years of life before him and was still, as time counts, in his prime, his farewell of the stage and of active life. It stands with *Cymbeline* and the *Winter's Tale* in the same relation to his work as a whole as the *Philoctetes* and *Edipus Coloneus* stand to the work of Sophocles. Between 1603 and about the end of 1610 he had been dwelling, so to speak, in the Inferno of tragedy. In *Cymbeline* and in the *Winter's Tale* he had emerged *a riveder le stelle*. They are the resolution of the discord, divine anticipations

of the vision, which in all its beauty and in all its completeness he unfolded in *The Tempest*. His philosophy in the tragedies is only not pessimistic because it is deduced in unprejudiced and comprehensive truthfulness from the facts of life, which, regarded as universally and as steadily as he had regarded them, afford no warrant for pessimism, though they do for occasional perplexity and profound sadness. But it is a long step from the mere absence of pessimism to the presence of optimism. Optimism can only come in with the faith, or with the dream, that the moral government of the world is a system tempering justice and righteousness with mercy and benevolence. Of such optimism we have only glimpses, more or less uncertain and unsteady, in the ancient classical poets, and with them it expresses itself chiefly in the relation of suffering to wisdom and moral purification. But the note of the philosophy of *Cymbeline* and of *The Tempest* is pure optimism: and it is the optimism of Christianity. Is it fanciful to suppose that as *Cymbeline* and more especially *The Tempest* seem to indicate that Shakespeare, whatever his religious creed may have been, was, as an artist and poet, perhaps also as a philosopher, struck with the sublime beauty of the Christian conception of life and of the government of the world? For more than eleven years the note of his work had been the sternest, the most uncompromising realism; his themes life on its darkest and saddest sides; his theology that of classical paganism. How changed is all this in *Cymbeline*, how transformed is all this in *The Tempest*.

In dealing with the symbolism of this divine drama it may be well first to take our stand on what seems simple and obvious. In the picture of Prospero the three things which at once strike us are the distinction made between the magician and the man, the relation of Prospero to Ariel, and of Ariel to Prospero, and the mood and temper with which Prospero, freeing Ariel, abandons his art to bury himself in privacy, "where every third thought shall be his grave." In the wand, in the magic robe, and in his books alone consists his power, alone lies all that distinguishes him from other men. Thus, in talking to Miranda as father to child, he lays down his mantle, "lie there my art." With them he could make Ariel his minister, and bow to his will the spirit powers of nature—

By whose aid
(Weak masters though ye be) I have bedimm'd
The noon-day sun, call'd forth the mutinous winds,
And 'twixt the green sea and the azured vault
Set roaring war: to the dread rattling thunder
Have I given fire, and rifled Jove's stout oak
With his own bolt: the strong-bas'd promontory
Have I made shake, and by the spurs pluck'd up
The pine and cedar; graves at my command
Have wak'd their sleepers: oped and let them forth
By my so potent art.

Ariel, in his unwillingness to work, in his pining for freedom, in his tricky caprices and in his uselessness except when under the control of a firm and wise will, is only too symbolic of genius, that perilous possession so potent under such control, so futile without it. "I shall miss thee, but yet thou shalt have freedom," are Prospero's words when he exacts from Ariel his last service, and servant and master are about to part for ever. And now, as the mighty magician prepares in accordance with his promise the farewell, "vanity of his art," he prepares also to take us into his confidence.

Be cheerful, Sir,
Our revels now are ended : these our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
Are melted into air, into thin air :
And like the baseless fabrick of this vision,
The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
And, like this unsubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind : we are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep. Sir, I am vex'd ;
Bear with my weakness ; my old brain is troubled :
Be not disturbed with my infirmity :
 a turn or two I'll take
To still my beating mind.

What remained when the wand, the mantle, the books and Ariel and the spirit-powers and all such solemn toys had been dismissed? the man alone and this vision,—infinite sadness, wisdom tempered with humility, submission, and,—perhaps,—hope.

Now my charms are all o'erthrown,
And what strength I have 's mine own,
Which is most faint . . .

.
Now I want
Spirits to enforce, art to enchant,
And my ending is despair,
Unless I be relieved by prayer,
Which pierces so, that it assaults
Mercy itself, and frees all faults.
As you from crimes would pardon'd be,
Let your indulgence set me free.

So, in farewell, spoke Prospero, just after he had "broken his

"staff," and "deeper than ever plummet sounded" drowned his book, and just before he passed into the silent life "where every third "thought" would "be his grave."

But does the symbolism of *The Tempest* go beyond this, is it yet more elaborate? Is the island the world, the *dramatis personæ* mankind, the government and central purpose of Prospero symbolic of the Christian conception of life and of life's control by Heaven? Rigid definition would of course instantly reduce such a theory to absurdity. But if we remember that allegory, still less symbolism, is not like a closely-fitting vesture which takes the mould of the whole form, and through which the contour of every limb is discernible, but lies lightly like some loose-flowing gauzy robe on its wearer, we can at least state a plausible case. Before Prospero arrives on the island pure nature reigns; the inhabitants Sycorax and Caliban are mere beasts; intelligence and genius, or at least the potentialities of each as symbolised in Ariel, pegged up by brute force in a pine, have mere vegetable life. With Prospero comes order and the dawn of civilisation. It is a place full of beauty and mystery, spirit powers float about, weird snatches of music are heard everywhere, it is "full of "noises, sounds and sweet airs that give delight and hurt not." Then it becomes peopled. What is this but the world? It would not be possible for a poet within the limits feasible for the number of *dramatis personæ* to include an assembly more essentially and comprehensively typical of mankind. In Prospero, for Prospero must take his place here, too, we have the highest type of humanity, intellectually and morally, the incarnation of wisdom, benevolence and humility, tempered with infinite sadness; in Stephano the mere gross brute; in Trinculo the brute with a gleam of intelligence and a touch of humour. Between these how many grades and varieties typical of human temper, character and experiences; youth—ardent, noble and chivalrous in Ferdinand; the world-battered veteran—shrewd, humorous and kindly in old Gonzalo; ambition's hard, cold, unscrupulous devotee in Antonio; and in Sebastian the weaker and more plastic worldling who takes the ply, the evil ply, from firmer natures; what are Adrian and Francisco and the rabble under battened hatches but the common herd who make and leave no mark either for good or for evil, passing

Qual fummo in aere, o in acqua la schiuma.

And of how many in life's poor game is Alonzo the symbol, so weary of it all, so listless, so hopeless, his past a wretched record of error and crime, his present a grievous burden of remorse and sorrow. Only one woman in the throng, but that woman the embodiment of the very essence of womanhood. In the first words she utters we

have the expression of passionately intense sympathy with distress and suffering, and a plea for pity.

O, I have suffer'd
With those I saw suffer! a brave vessel,
Who had no doubt some noble creatures in her,
Dash'd all to pieces. O the cry did knock
Against my very heart! Poor souls! . . .
Had I been any god of power I would
Have sunk the sea within the earth, or e'er
It should the good ship so have swallow'd, and
The freighting souls within her.

When her father unfolds his story to her her comment is:—

O my heart bleeds
To think of the teen that I have turn'd you to.

Again, as the narrative proceeds and what concerned herself might have been expected to appeal to her, the note is the same, the same utter selflessness,—

"Alack! what trouble
Was I then to you!

As soon as her curiosity is roused it becomes importunate, and her father has to say apparently with some impatience: "Here 'cease more questions." The moment she sees Ferdinand the woman's natural instinct, in all innocence and purity, is instantly awakened, fancy and imagination as instantly kindling with it. He is "a spirit," a "divine thing, for nothing natural I ever saw so noble." "Have pity, I'll be his surety!" she cries, when her father affects to wave him aside, calling him a spy and a traitor. And then as soon as love has been awakened in her and fully returned

Hence bashful cunning!
And prompt me, plain and holy innocence!
I am your wife, if you will marry me;
If not, I'll die your maid: to be your fellow
You may deny me; but I'll be your servant
Whether you will or no.

And with love come perfect trust, implicit submission—"I would not 'play you false," says Ferdinand; "no, not for the world." "Yes," she instantly replies, "for a score of kingdoms you should wrangle, 'and I would call it fair play." When she sees the very mixed company on that island thronging in—Alonzo, Gonzalo, Sebastian, Antonio and their attendants—amazed and spellbound as they are before Prospero's absolution frees them, she exclaims:—

O! Wonder!
How many goodly creatures are there here!
How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world
That has such people in't

Women may owe their foibles to nature, but they owe their vices and darker traits to men, and when did woman, not as experience, but as God has made her, ever see aught but "goodly creatures" or aught but beauty in this world and its masters?

But in the inhabitants of this island Shakespeare has not given us types of humanity only, he has given us something more, he has given us man in the making, man before the elements composing him were harmonised, and all in him was yet chaos. This surely is the meaning of Caliban, this his relation to the other *dramatis personæ*. Foul, malignant and brutal though he be, he has yet the religious instinct, for he wishes Stephano to be his god; and the instinct of service, for he has sincere desire to serve him; the æsthetic sense, and that in a very high degree, for to music he not only listens in rapt delight, but it awakens in him the imagination and fancy of a poet.

Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments
Will hum about my ears : and sometimes voices
That, if I had then waked after long sleep
Will make me sleep again : and then in dreaming
The clouds, methought, would open and shew riches
Ready to drop upon me ; that, when I wak'd,
I cry'd to dream again.

He appreciates instruction and is grateful to those who will teach him. "When thou can'st first," he says to Prospero:—

Thou strok'st me and mad'st much of me, would'st give me
Water with berries in't : and teach me how
To name the bigger light and how the less
That burn by day and night : and then I lov'd thee.

It will thus be seen that in Caliban exist, crudely and in embryo, elements which, when duly tempered and harmonised, not only make man, but contribute very essentially to what constitute the eminence and glory of man.

Such is the island, and such are its inhabitants. Turn we now to the plot; it and its incidents are exact counterparts in symbol of life and of its scheme and government as they present themselves to the optimist and Christian. There could indeed be no better commentary on the impression made by the action when its evolution is complete than the noble lines in Pope's *Essay on Man*:—

All Nature is but art, unknown to thee,
All chance direction which thou can'st not see ;
All discord harmony, not understood,
All partial evil universal good,
And spite of pride in erring Reason's spite,
One truth is clear, whatever is is right.

Disentangling what obviously pertains to the allegory from what has as obviously only dramatic significance, what do we find? A

Power omnipotent in the world it controls has been most grievously wronged and outraged, its wrongers and enemies being its own subjects, and those in whose loyalty it had a right to confide. Years pass; sin and crime prosper, and retribution sleeps. At last that Power asserts itself. Sin must be expiated, crime must be punished, but how? In a meshwork of irony and in perplexing mazes of apparent contradictions, inconsistencies and confusion is to come the answer, the substitution of repentance for punishment, perfect and final forgiveness for wrong done, sealed and ratified by the marriage of the child of the wronged one with the child of the wronger. But that its double purpose might be attained, how perplexing to those whom it most concerns is this gracious and benevolent scheme, a scheme for the furtherance of which every incident is designed, worked out. Well might Gonzalo exclaim—

All torment, trouble, wonder and amazement
Inhabits here. Some Heavenly power guide us
Out of this fearful country!

—their ship wrecked, their all lost, storm and terror and menace on every side of them, their king's son and heir apparently drowned, and he himself in blank despair, while amid these miseries treachery and meditated murder are again at work; and then come, in the train of the last sin, astonishment and madness. But, one there is who "smiling knows that all is well," even he who, attributing their crimes, past and present, to "ignorance," will accept their repentance, and as he holds them spell-bound and impotent before him will pronounce their doom—

Though with their high wrongs I am struck to the quick,
Yet with my nobler reason, 'gainst my fury
Do I take part: the rarer action is
In virtue than in vengeance: they being penitent,
The sole drift of my purpose doth extend
Not a frown further.

The whole play is saturated with irony, an irony reversing the terrible irony of the tragedies; its very title is ironical—that tempest which was no tempest, that wreck which was no wreck, that salvation in loss, that harmony in discord, that gracious purpose masking itself in menace and terror. In these respects, and still more perhaps in the relation of the persons of the drama to the Power controlling them, may be read analogies to life, as life presents itself to the eyes of an optimistic faith to which

All is well, tho' faith and form
Be sunder'd in the night of fear;
Well roars the storm to those that hear
A deeper voice across the storm.

Though Prospero reveals the all-reconciling, all-harmonising secret to none but his minister Ariel before the time comes to reveal it fully, he yet grants some glimpses of it to those who are worthy, that faith may give them comfort. So he says to Gonzalo, who is doubting his identity with the island's ruler,—

You do yet taste
Some subtilties o' the isle, that will not let you,
Believe things certain.

and so again when Alonso says—

This is as strange a maze as e'er men trod,
And there is in this business more than Nature
Was ever conduct of: some oracle
Must rectify our knowledge.

he replies—

Sir, my liege,
Do not infest your mind with beating on
The strangeness of this business: at pick'd leisure,
Which shall be shortly, single I'll resolve you
(Which to you shall seem probable) of every
These happen'd accidents, *till when, be cheerful*
And think of each thing well.

If we compare this with what Stephano says, "Every man shift for all the rest, and let no man take care for himself: for all is but fortune," we shall measure the difference between life as it is read by the "initiated" and as it is read by the ignorant. It is said, that just before Conington passed away he was heard to murmur the words, "Now the vision is complete—this is the way they see in Heaven." When we compare the way in which life is read and interpreted in those two divine last dramas, *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest*, with its presentment and interpretation in the long and sombre series of dramas which preceded them, the words have, we feel, a strange propriety in their application to Shakespeare. Assuredly it was in the light of such a vision that *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest* were composed, and the most comprehensive survey of life ever given by man to man found its culmination.

Let me repeat that all allegorical interpretation will not only defeat its own ends, but be in danger of becoming simply ridiculous the moment it assumes the form of rigid or even of too precise definition; for it is with the symbolism of such a work as *The Tempest* what it is with the symbolism of which Goethe has said—

Gefühl ist alles;
Name ist Schall und Rauch
Umnebelnd himmelsgluth.

That there is an inexpressible fascination about *The Tempest*, a fascination quite independent of its dramatic and æsthetic interest, no

one, I think, can deny. A mellow light as of a setting sun broods over it: it has strange spiritual charm. Such a note as we have in—

All thy vexations
Were but my trials of thy love, and thou
Hast strangely stood the test

will partly, perhaps, indicate what is meant.

For this spiritual charm I have tried to account, believing that it comes in a large measure from a suffusion of purely Christian sentiment. There is nothing to indicate that Shakespeare accepted Christianity on its dogmatic and metaphysical sides as a creed, but as a philosopher it must have appealed to him, indeed it did appeal to him in its ethics, and as a poet and artist he could scarcely fail to realise the beauty and sublimity of the solution it afforded of the problems of life. Had his last legacy to the world been the gospel deducible from the tragedies, that gospel would indeed have been a cheerless one. But on the Shakespeare of *The Tempest* and *Cymbeline* fell at last the light that had fallen on the Milton of *Samson Agonistes*, and the two mightiest geniuses who have glorified our poetry left the world with the same optimistic message on their lips, with this difference only, that pious submission, touched, perhaps, with hope, was the note of the one, and faith, absolute and uncompromising, the note of the other.

J. CHURTON COLLINS.

OXFORD FINANCE: A REJOINDER.

WHEN Dr. A. J. Butler opens his reply to my article on "Oxford Finance" with the assertion that "seldom has a more unfair and erroneous statement of a case been made," he betrays a warmth of feeling hardly compatible with clear reason and calm judgment. This is all the more marked when he at once proceeds to show that he has not yet learned the vocabulary of the science he is dealing with. Had he been less irate he might have taken more time to appreciate the real meaning of the terms I used. Instead of doing that he gives them quite different meanings suggested by his own excited feelings. The inevitable result is that he discovers imaginary errors and plunges into mare's nests.

One of these mare's nests is large enough to swallow up the respectable sum of £327,000 a year. It occurs in the following passage, which, in order to be strictly fair to Dr. Butler, I reproduce verbatim from the original article:—

EXPENSES OF UNDERGRADUATES AT OXFORD.

Food and wine bills	£327,000
Fees and dues	131,987
Room rents	23,655
Profits on buttery and kitchen, etc	7,312
	£489,954 •

In explaining the above table it was stated that the three last items were official, but that the first was an estimate based on 3,270 undergraduates at £100 per head. That estimate was, of course, open to question, and Dr. Butler does in fact question it, but of that later on. I have first to deal with his extraordinary allegation that "the whole of this £327,000 is wrongly added to the total of Oxford

"revenues." These words are put in italics in order to impress them on the casual reader. If the casual reader will refer to the table above quoted he will find that it is headed "Expenses of Under-graduates at Oxford." I put it to him, How could these expenses have been correctly shown without including the food and wine bills? The most frugal undergraduate could hardly live on fees, dues and room rents, could he?

It is true that the £327,000 is also referred to in the context as part of the "total of Oxford revenues," but as part of the gross and not of the net total. Though Dr. Butler, I believe, is bursar of his College (Brasenose), he seems on this occasion to have altogether forgotten the distinction between gross and net revenues. He assumes that I regarded this £327,000 a year as free revenue which the University could do what it pleased with, and out of which it might provide the improvements desired by Lord Curzon's Committee. It is trifling with the subject to call for a formal denial of anything so absurd.

In the context this £327,000 was spoken of as part of "the annual turnover" of the University, and even an Oxford Don should know that turnover and net revenue are very different things. In another place it was spoken of as part of "the money actually handled," which, again, is a very different thing from net income. But even a reader who failed to understand these simple financial terms might have been saved from falling into Dr. Butler's mare's nest by finding the net revenues of the Colleges separately dealt with at a later stage of my article. Here official figures alone are used, without estimates or supplements of any kind.

So far from the Colleges having been made out to appear richer than they are, as regards free revenue, their own figures were given literally. They rest on the authority of Professor Price, who, like Dr. Butler, is bursar of his College (Oriel). This reminds me that Dr. Butler declares it to be an "extraordinary thing that the statistics for the University are taken from the year 1906, and those for the College from the year 1903." For that apparent anomaly there were no less than three good reasons. First, the College accounts for 1906 are out of print; secondly, it would have taken weeks of hard work to consolidate and analyse them as Professor Price has done those of 1903; thirdly, Dr. Price's authority as a well-known member of the University, and a College bursar to boot, will go much farther with the public than that of any outside critic could do.

Having, I trust, justified my own treatment of this disputed £327,000, I now turn the tables on Dr. Butler and examine his method of dealing with it. First, he deducts from the total number of undergraduates those in lodgings—whom he estimates at 1,000—and then he cuts down the average expenditure on food and wine bills from £100 to £60 a year. By these two sweeping curtailments

he gets my total of £327,000 reduced to £144,200. Unfortunately they are open to certain fatal objections, both from the undergraduates' point of view and that of the University. The undergraduate must eat and drink whether he is in College or in lodgings. Dr. Butler admits that even when he is in lodgings the College kitchen and common room get £20 a year out of him. He may, however, spend three or four times as much outside, and that, whatever it may be, is just as much under the supervision of the authorities as his expenditure inside. There may be some difference in the method of supervision, but the result is the same.

Dr. Butler, in disclaiming all the outside expenditure of undergraduates, shows himself strangely forgetful of one of the fundamental principles of the University, that its jurisdiction over its members extends to every one living within a mile and a half of Carfax. It is equally responsible for all within that area, whether they be in College or in lodgings. Whatever any undergraduate pays for living expenses is part of the "turnover" of the University in the sense in which I used that term. There can be still less doubt that it is part of the expenditure which his parents have to provide for. If Dr. Butler really wishes to know what "business men would say of Mr. Lawson's arithmetic" on this point, by all means let him consult a few parents.

We come now to the question of average cost per head per annum for "food and wine bills," or, as I should rather have said, for "living expenses." It was difficult to find a term in ordinary use which correctly conveys the meaning of the Oxford word "battels." The one which, after consideration, I did adopt I now find much too narrow. "Battels" nowadays embrace a good many other things than food and wine. "The Student's Handbook" (seventeenth edition, 1906), an official publication of the Clarendon Press, states that "the totals of Battels have been constantly increasing during the past few years by the facilities offered to undergraduates for obtaining through the College necessities formerly supplied by tradesmen."

This new branch of Oxford life is operated through the Common Room, which in an up-to-date College is practically a Civil Service store. Dr. Butler, though of course well aware of this recent development of "battels," fixes on the much more limited term "food and wine bills," and declares my estimate of £100 a year to be "gross exaggeration." No doubt for food and wine alone it might be too high, but the very heading of the table shows that more than that was intended. Had I said "food and wine, etc.," Dr. Butler's charge of "gross exaggeration" would at once have fallen to the ground.

I may be allowed to explain the process by which this £100 average was arrived at. Its starting point was the information obtained from parents of undergraduates and undergraduates themselves that the

total expenditure at Oxford ranged from £120 up to £270 a year. Dr. Butler not only accepts this range, but he puts it rather higher. No sooner has he finished denouncing my £100 a year for "food and wine bills" as gross exaggeration, than he makes an unexpected admission, as follows:—"But it may be remarked that "when he (Mr. Lawson) gives £150 to £270* as the total cost of "education at Oxford the estimate is—within its own wide limits—"not unfair."

Let us start, then, from what Dr. Butler admits to be "not unfair," and make a fresh calculation. To a certain extent the expenditure of the £150 to £270 a year can be definitely traced. What may be distinguished as the fixed charges of the University are clearly enough stated in the "Students' Handbook," and other official publications. They include room rent, averaging £10 to £12 a year; tuition fees, varying from £20 to £27 a year, and about £20 a year for dues (University and College), servants and establishment charges. These three items together amount to £45 or £50 a year. With the exception of club subscriptions and a few minor items they are all compulsory. But over and above this £50 a year all expenditure is optional and within the discretion of the undergraduate.

A youth at Oxford whose bills run to £150 a year is thus spending £50 on his education and £100 on himself. One whose bills run up to £200 a year spends £50 on education and £150 on himself. The £300 a year man spends £50 on education and £250 on himself. Moreover, this is for the Oxford year of about thirty weeks, and not for the full calendar year of fifty-two weeks. The personal expenditure seems to be out of all proportion to the educational expenditure. Dr. Butler appears to agree with me on this point, if on no other. The only palliation he has to offer for it is a disputable suggestion that if personal expenses were added to my estimates of the cost of education at Scottish and German Universities they might be raised to the Oxford level. The latter, he says, "includes the cost "of clothes and other personal expenses, and it is unfair that these "items should be omitted in the estimate for Scottish and German "Universities, while included for Oxford."

If Dr. Butler will kindly remember that the Scottish estimate of £60 a year for living expenses applies to the academic year of about twenty-six weeks, and means £120 for the calendar year, he will see that it amply covers legitimate expenditure of every kind. Not many Scottish students ever have the chance to live at the rate of £120 a year, clothes and washing included.

In conclusion, I will concede one point to Dr. Butler, namely, the uselessness of attempting to draw any comparison between the teaching staffs of Oxford and of any other University, ancient or modern. That was not an essential part of my critique on

* My figures, it will be noted, were £120 to £270.

Oxford finance, and might as well have been left out. To show that I attached no importance to it, it was prefaced with the qualification that "comparison between Oxford and any University conducted on "professorial lines is vitiated by the teaching work at Oxford being "divided and sub-divided among so many different classes of "teachers." In a maze of professors, lecturers, readers, tutors, and examiners, the plain man gets hopelessly lost.

Another concession I may make to him, that in the intricate work of distinguishing between graduate and undergraduate fees, and of tracing cross entries between University and College accounts he has the advantage of me. But with all due deference I submit that he has failed to shake the main contention of the article on Oxford finance, namely, that Oxford, before appealing for a quarter of a million of new money, might have tried to make its existing resources go a little farther. Both collegiate and undergraduate expenditure may admit of reconsideration.

W. R. LAWSON.

NATAL AND THE ZULUS.

AS it is only a few weeks since I was in a district of Natal occupied by Zulus, I may perhaps offer a few criticisms regarding the recent disturbances in that Colony.

A prominent Liberal organisation has suggested an Imperial enquiry into the conditions of the Zulu people. No such enquiry, however, is requisite; the facts are well known to the Imperial and Natal Governments and to leading citizens in Natal and at home.

The Zulus are a fine fighting race: 6 feet is an average height among them: they are bright, good-natured fellows, and the white settlers recognise their excellent qualities and respect them. At the same time it must be remembered that many of them have hardly emerged from a semi-barbarous state: their wives are still chattels; civilised labour is unwelcome to them, and the love of battle is not dead. We here in London must pardon a nervous feeling among the clerks and shopkeepers of Durban, for the Zulus outnumber them by ten to one, and without firearms the Natal settlers would stand no chance in a rising. These Zulus are in every house in Durban, serving as house-boys, nurses, gardeners or porters; but all the time they are subject to their tribal chief. His word is law; and they have been encouraged to obey him implicitly by the Government at Pietermaritzburg, which recognises the chief and acts through him. If the chief commands a massacre, the Zulus will massacre; if he prohibits it, they abstain; if he calls them to the kraal, they return, leaving their work and their belongings in the town, without a word of notice. If they disobey, their wives are killed and their position in the tribe is lost.

The chiefs are often brandy-drinkers, quarrelsome fellows, unjust, actuated by personal motives, greedy of power and money, and opposed to all efforts to raise their people for fear of their authority being undermined. Their administration of justice is incompetent and even venal. In 1852 the Kaffir Commission, comprising thirteen

British and eleven Dutch members, condemned the system of hereditary chieftainship: but no practical result followed the Commission. The hereditary chief is still supported by the Government and still exacts implicit obedience. Many a war has been waged by the chiefs with the reluctant consent of the tribesmen. It is all very fine for those who are far away to laugh at the sudden mobilisation of white troops and the precautions taken by the Natal Ministry. You might just as well laugh at John Bull for building so large a navy in time of peace. The danger is exaggerated in both cases perhaps; but in Natal, as here, the elector tells you that prevention is better than cure.

The facts are briefly these: (1) The Zulus have serious grievances which cause grave discontent; (2) the Government lacks the money and perhaps the statesmanship to remedy these grievances; (3) the Natal settlers, like all Englishmen, desire beyond everything to maintain intact the privileges and franchises granted by the Mother Country, and also to justify the responsibility they have accepted.

I said at the outset that no further enquiry was necessary: the truth is, we have been supplied by the Colonial Government itself with a complete statement of Zulu grievances. As the Blue-book in which these are published has not been widely circulated, either here or in Natal, I extract a few sentences from the Report of the Native Affairs Commission appointed by the Natal Government last year, a copy of which I have been permitted to see.

They [*the Zulus*] attribute all their troubles to the Government. They see the hand of the Government in the high rents and labour demanded by landlords; the various taxes they have to pay; the numerous passes or permits they have to be provided with; the restrictive, unfamiliar and unknown laws they have to submit to; the compulsory service they have to render upon public works; and the disintegration of their tribal and family systems.

Their obligations have increased, but their ability to meet them has lessened by the loss of their cattle by disease, their crops by locusts, by a growing neglect of cultivation, especially by the women, and by a general reduction in wages and openings for employment.

In Zululand they are apprehensive about alienation of their lands for European occupation. The vital necessity of reserving more of Zululand for the overflow from Natal, as well as for the material increase of the resident population, is one of the most pressing aspects of the question and must receive immediate attention.

A large number are indebted to Europeans and to Indians for money advanced at high rates of interest or to secure their labour at low wages. The Courts enforce these contracts, . . . cattle are seized and sold judicially. . . .

We have not satisfied any of the various classes which go to form the native section of the community.

No marked degree of individual progress in agriculture, architecture or handicrafts, manners or morals can be discovered as due to direct Government action.

Weighed and wanting must be the reluctant verdict upon past efforts to reconcile them to changed conditions of rule and policy.

In the past . . . lack of knowledge, poverty of resource, erroneous methods and want of self-reliance.

The more intelligent and reflective among the natives frequently draw comparisons between the consideration and treatment shown them in the pre-responsible Government days, when the personal factor had sway, and what it is to-day when the element has been practically eliminated altogether. A system of Government which disregards natural laws is doomed to failure.

* Both the administrative and legislative sides of the Government should earnestly reconsider the whole scheme of native administration.

If this be delayed or neglected, the warning should be given that, without claiming the possession of predictive powers, the cumulative effect of the immense mass of evidence justified the right to foretell, with reasonable accuracy, what the result of a refusal to adopt and apply alleviative measures will be, viz., continued discontent and distrust, and a possible further explosion of the pent-up forces of disaffection. . . mere palliatives will not suffice, or the rill of discontentment to-day will, if not controlled, become the torrent of malcontentment to-morrow.

Parliament stands virtually in the relationship of an oligarchy to the natives, and naturally it studies more the interests of the [electoral] constituencies.

These people are admitted by all competent judges to be wonderfully easy to govern if only they are dealt with in the right way.

(N.B.—Only 3,873 Zulus rebelled last year out of 900,000.)

The following grievances of the Zulus are noted in a summary appended by the Commissioners at the end of this report :—

- Absence of a general protector of native interests and welfare.
- Difficulty of access to the Secretary for Native Affairs.
- Unsatisfactory promulgation of laws.
- Excessive rents charged by Europeans.
- Too many laws, over-legislation and administration.
- The Poll Tax and its effect upon the young men in adding to their reluctance to assist their fathers.
- The Dog Tax.
- Compulsory labour on roads and public works.

Harsh methods adopted by the police.

Arrest of members of a tribe by police without the chief's knowledge.

Attendance of police at social gatherings.

Interference by Europeans of various classes with women and girls.

Usury.

Unfair terms made by Europeans when advancing money in return for labour.

If the words of this Government Report, bound in sober blue, came from the pen of a Massingham or a W. T. Stead, he would be accused by the Yellow Press of yellow journalism.

This Commission took evidence from over 5,000 natives; its conclusions were intensely unpopular in Natal; and it speaks much for the fairmindedness of the Commissioners that they should have so roundly condemned the policy of their own Colony.

As regards the lack of money to remedy these grievances, the figures of the Colonial Treasurer speak for themselves. The policy of Protection may succeed in some places; but in Natal it has produced an alarming deficit.

Last year £300,000 in direct taxation was extracted from the natives by hut tax, dog tax, fines and court fees, poll tax, licences and rents; to this must be added £27,000 in indirect taxation, for the native is taxed on his beads, blankets, shawls, tobacco, food stuffs, clothing and boots, and of this amount the Government can only afford £7,500 for the education of the Zulus. Until the tribal organisation is broken up, a system of individual tenure substituted, and headmen appointed instead of hereditary chiefs, wars and rumours of wars will continue. This at any rate was the deliberate opinion of Sir Henry Elliott as stated before the South African Commission.

It should certainly be urged on behalf of Natal that the unrest of the Zulu is only one phase of a long struggle between white and black, and that Natal is now bearing single-handed the brunt of a conflict which British and Dutch settlers have faced from time to time during the last century; and it must be said she has acted her part with far greater consideration for the natives than did many of the early settlers, and certainly than the Chartered Company or the Germans of South-West Africa have done.

What is the remedy?

Sir Theophilus Shepstone, in giving evidence before the Natal Natives Commission in 1881-2, said: "As a rule natives are a law-abiding people, but they like to have their say about any law which may affect them;" and in reply to the question whether he "did not think that a native representative assembly would be dangerous," he replied (see page 289 of the Report): "No doubt danger might arise, but there *must* be some machinery or system by which their views can be ascertained, and their consent obtained to any changes which

"affect them. They *must* have someone they know to represent them "and someone in whom they have confidence."

The Rev. Frederick Mason, of Durban, the venerable and beloved patriarch of the Methodist Church of Natal, recently printed in the *Natal Mercury* some valuable articles on this subject. To these I am indebted for some of my facts and arguments. He estimates that 100,000 out of 900,000 natives are Christianised. These are loyal and attached to civilised rule, but they have outgrown the old native system of government. A newspaper in the vernacular represents their views, and they are qualified for separate treatment.

Lord Milner's Native Affairs Commission also reported in favour of representation. They said that in the interests of both races, for the contentment of the native population and better consideration of their interests, it was desirable to allow them some measure of representation in the legislatures of the country. They recommended further that the qualification for the native vote should be the same as for the European; that a central College should be established to train native teachers and to afford higher education to native students. Yet in spite of all these warnings, and in spite of their own Commission of last year, no sufficient change has been made by the Colonial Government. Even Mr. Mason admits that there has been no improvement in native matters since Natal received responsible government. He quotes Major Sprigg's statement (in the *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW*) that the Natal Government was very unsympathetic; that the treatment of the natives was harsh and often unjust; he himself condemns the ill-treatment of native servants in Durban, and deplores the bad example of Europeans as regards drunkenness and immorality. He deplores the lack of sympathy toward the Zulu, and "the selfish and "godless theory that the black man was created solely for the benefit "of the white."

It is to be hoped that the unification of South Africa will bring with it better times for the Zulus, with some form of representation in the new Parliament of the South African Commonwealth.

R. C. HAWKIN.

THE GOVERNMENT AND OLD AGE PENSIONS.

"The question as to whether thrift is discouraged by Old Age Pensions has been enquired into by Your Commissioners, and they have arrived at the conclusion that the fact of a necessitous person being entitled to a pension of 10s. a week at the age of 65 years will not have any appreciable influence on saving habits at an earlier age."—*Report of the Australian Royal Commission, 1907.*

"I found in Denmark that the people who had most right to speak with authority on the subject maintain that the law has not acted in a way detrimental to thrift. The Inspector-General of the Sick Relief Funds holds that they are more thrifty.—'Never so eager to insure against sickness as now.'"—*Miss Sellers' evidence before Aged Pensioners Committee, 1903; p. 5.*

IT is already becoming perfectly clear that the fate of the Government during the next few years will largely depend on their success or failure in dealing with the question of Old Age Pensions. As the time approaches for Mr. Asquith's promised scheme the air becomes full of many voices—some counselling, others threatening, some already supporting and others already condemning his unborn proposals. Never was there such a conflict of opinions. There are some who solemnly assure us that any scheme at all, even if it take the shape of the most modest beginning, will mean the ruin of the Free Trade cause. There are others who, with a zeal of denunciation that only develops when the Liberal Party is concerned, proclaim to the world the predestined incapacity of the present Government to deal with this matter at all. "All or nothing" is the cry of the second party, just as "nothing" is the cry of the first. To give pensions at all, says the *Spectator*, will launch us on the slippery slope of Protection. To give anything short of universal pensions, says the Labour Party, will be the final betrayal of the popular trust.

England does not love extremes; and these rival counsels will to some extent cancel one another. The public will scarcely take the

Labour policy on this matter very seriously as long as it continues to repudiate all responsibility for the financial side of the question. "We make the proposals, and the Exchequer finds the money," is not, on the face of it, a convincing contribution to political thought. The English, too, are a just and pitiful people, and are not likely to fall in love with the suggestion that the price of Free Trade should be paid in the continued misery and neglect of our aged poor. It can scarcely be that Free Trade is so tender a plant that it should need to be watered with the tears of the old. Standing between these two extremes of advice, the Government will have a splendid opportunity of framing a scheme which may claim the traditional English quality of compromise.

HOW THE OLD ARE TREATED NOW.

The situation, indeed, gives the Liberals a chance of doing what is so rare in politics—looking the facts in the face. For it is sometimes forgotten that, however politicians may vary, the facts remain as they have been. The condition of the aged British poor remains very much the same. The only difference is that since the question was first raised more than one generation of the aged poor have gone down to disappointed and disillusioned graves. The fact revealed by Sir Charles Booth fourteen years ago—that one in every four of our aged poor becomes a pauper—is still true to-day. Hood's famous epitaph could still be written over the grave of a vast proportion,—

"Rattle his bones over the stones,
He's only a pauper whom nobody owns."

Blessed are the poor, it may still be said, who die early in England. The old tragedies still go on—the break-up of the homes, the vast drift to the workhouses, the burden of shame and distress that falls upon the most deserving part of our population. The only change in the lot of the old people whom one sees sitting in grey lines of dull apathy, in front of workhouses that form so grim a contrast to the beauty of our English country houses, is that there is added to their former agony the new heart-sickness of hope deferred.

If anyone imagines that things have become better, let him look at the figures given in the statistical tables of that very illuminating Blue-book produced by the Local Government Board a few months ago. Those tables show that four out of five adult paupers in England are either aged or infirm.* They show that out of 1,337,984 poor aged persons, no less than 368,000, or more than Sir Charles Booth's one in four of 1894, are estimated to have received relief in any one day in 1907. It is difficult to forget that these people, if they were

* *Old Age Pensions*. C.D. 3618. Price 51d. In 1902 (the last decennial record), 399,000 out of 500,000 adult paupers were classed as "not able-bodied," or, in other words, aged and infirm (*id.*, Table No. III., p. 49).

Germans, would receive, in place of the shameful dole of pauperism, an honourable allowance to mitigate their bodily misfortunes.*

But that is not all. Of the other odd million and a third aged poor, at least half a million may be safely taken to be shivering on the brink of pauperism, living on pittance scarcely sufficient to hold body and soul together. How many actually do fade away from insufficient nutrition it would be difficult to calculate; but it is a significant fact that the population over 75 in the 1901 census was less than half the population over 70.†

THE FAILURE OF VOLUNTARY INSURANCE.

These are the root facts of the situation, and they are, as I say, practically the same now as when Mr. Chamberlain first raised the hopes of the working classes at the great General Election of 1895. The great fallacy into which we are liable to fall is to accept the grey and blue uniforms of these poor people as implying a moral taint of pauperism. We forget that they are really the picked survivors of our population, and only artificially created paupers, created out of industrial conditions which are practically prohibitive of that kind of thrift that anticipates old age. It is the unhappy fact that the probability of old age is not at present sufficiently actual to the average working person in this country to become a spur and an incentive to steady and continuous saving. Life is not yet secure enough. There is always a working belief in the power of kind fate, either by accident or disease, to bring her kindly release before the tools have to be dropped.

It does not, indeed, lie in the mouths of the middle class to accuse the working classes of thriftlessness. Let the purveyor of that particular type of drawing-room prattle consider the £5,000,000 in the chests of the Trade Unions, the £70,000,000 of the Building Societies, and, last but not least, the £50,000,000 of the Friendly and Benevolent Societies contributed by 14,000,000 working men and women. Or let them take the £166,000,000 standing to the credit of 10,332,000 depositors, mostly of the working class, in the Post Office Savings Bank for the year 1906. When the middle classes have anything to surpass these evidences of individual and sustained thrift, then, and then alone, will they have the right to throw stones.

But it is the sorry fact that the Friendly Societies which have collected such vast sums for the relief of sickness and death have not succeeded in persuading the working classes to make any

* Out of our total population over 65 years of age, 46 per thousand, or, in other words, 93,000 are indoor paupers, and 128 per thousand (259,000) are outdoor paupers (p. 49). The total number of persons over 65 years of age at the census in 1901 was 2,018,716. The official estimate for the year 1907 is 2,116,267. Of those 778,283 are estimated according to the calculations of the Hamilton Committee to possess over 10/- a week. That leaves 1,337,984 poor aged persons, including criminals and aliens (p. 34).

† Over 70—1,205,069; over 75—600,850.

extensive provision for old age. The Post Office annuities provided for the same purpose have been an increasing and almost ridiculous failure. The same causes that have led to the failure of these schemes are now recognised as rendering it practically useless to waste any further time over the voluntary schemes at one time put forward by Mr. Chamberlain and various eminent philanthropists, schemes so popular in their day, but now practically extinct.

Here then, to sum up, we have the problem before any Government. We find that out of the poor old people in the United Kingdom at any given moment, rather more than one in four are paupers, and a great proportion of the others in chronic want: that in spite of the immense increase of voluntary thrift in all other branches of life the working poor still make no voluntary provision for their old age: while in the meantime the working age is growing shorter and the average duration of working-class life steadily longer

THE GERMAN CONTRIBUTORY SYSTEM.

If political pledges have any value, we may take it that there will be no practical division of opinion between the parties as to dealing in some manner with so grave a social trouble. The lines on which the debate will run during the discussions next session will probably turn solely around the form that any Old Age Pensions scheme is to take. There are two principal schools of thought. On the one side are those who will have nothing to do with any scheme that does not rest upon voluntary or compulsory individual contributions. These may now be taken roughly as advocates of the German system.* There is, indeed, something very splendid about the national discipline which has enabled the Germans to work their vast Imperial system of compulsory insurance and quadruple relief. It is easy to pick holes in that system, and to point out that the age is too high† and that the saddest case of all, the aged widow, is still too often left outside.

* The German Pension system was started by the law of June 22, 1889, which came into operation in 1891. It established a system of pensions that may be described as "deferred annuities," resting upon a contributory system guaranteed by employers and assisted by the State. The system was at first confined to "workmen, assistants, journeymen, apprentices, sailors, domestic servants and clerks over sixteen," and afterwards extended to foremen and teachers, but always and still excluding officials, professional soldiers and State pensioners. The right to a pension begins at seventy, when the old man or woman receives a yearly annuity based on the amount insured, plus an Imperial grant of £2 10s. a year. There are four classes of insured, ranging according to wages, and with an insurance payment amounting to from 2d. a week to 4d. The employers are responsible to the State for payment, but are permitted to subtract half, being the workman's share, from wages. The payments are made through the Post Office, and are recorded by means of special stamps on special cards. Repayments are made to the widows and children of men who die. There are thirty-one insurance offices and districts, with a supervisory council and board of arbitration. Pensions must be claimed; and by the law of 1897 there is now an Empire Fund, equalising the burden between manufacturing districts and agricultural which are found by experience to have far the larger number of old age pensioners.

† The age is 70. The pension depends on employment, and therefore the woman often drops out.

No system either in Germany or in England is going to be perfect at once. The fact that 13,000,000 out of a population of 59,000,000 Germans, or 920 out of every 1,000 of the working classes, are now insured against sickness, accident or old age, is a source of legitimate pride to all German public men.

But the German system seems to have no friends in this country, either among the employers who would become the guarantors, or the employés who would have to submit to the system of weekly deduction from wages and official stamping which is essential to its success. Germany possesses an entirely different set of social habits, with different virtues and different faults—a military spirit which penetrates into the life of every family, and an allied network of police supervision and individual notification which can always be brought to the help of the supervisory councils and boards. Rightly or wrongly, it seems to be generally agreed that the British working classes would not consent to those conditions, even if they brought with them the social millennium. It is difficult to graft the virtues of discipline on to the virtues of independence.

The national sentiment on this debatable point seems to have been summed up for the moment by the Prime Minister in his speech of November 25th, 1906, when he opposed any contributory scheme on the ground that it would involve "inquisitorial machinery altogether inconsistent with the best traditions of the country and the thoughts of its people." It is difficult, indeed, to dogmatise about a people which, in spite of its rooted individualism, has accepted the Education and the Factory Acts, with their complex system of "inquisitorial" interference, both in homes and workshops. But for practical and immediate purposes this question must be said to have been closed by that speech of the Prime Minister, countersigned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE UNIVERSAL PENSIONS SCHEME.

At the opposite pole to the contributory scheme stands the proposal for universal pensions to all old people as a civic right, without either condition or contribution. This proposal has gained the great distinction and importance of being supported by Sir Charles Booth, and is now put forward in its complete integrity by the Labour and Socialist Parties. What would be its financial cost and social consequences at the present moment?

The financial estimate for the cost of a universal scheme at the rate of 5s a week to all persons over 65 in the United Kingdom is given in the Blue-book as £27,500,000, apart from the cost of administration—or in other words, as equivalent to a poll tax of 12s. 6d. per head of the population of the country. If the age were raised to 70 the cost would be reduced to £16,302,000; but of course these figures would be liable to a rapid expansion which cannot be calculated with any accuracy, though the official estimate is that in

1921 we should require 30 millions in order to give a universal old age pension to all over 65. It is a sufficient comment on these figures to say that no financier has yet suggested any possibility of immediately raising such sums for this purpose except by those far-reaching schemes of protective taxation which were rejected by the country at the last General Election, or by those equally bold proposals for penalising, if not banishing, the rich, to which public opinion has certainly not yet assented.

But the financial aspect of the universal scheme is not by any means the only or even the most important part of the matter. Let us for a moment exercise our imagination on the social result. We have to suppose the whole adult population in the prime of life taxing themselves to the bone—for what purpose? To contemplate every Saturday a procession to every post office in the land of old men and women, the great majority of whom would be either ostentatiously well-to-do, conspicuously undeserving, or even obviously alien or criminal, in order to receive the precious crown pieces hardly spared from the family budgets of those in full working vigour. Could any nation be imagined sufficiently inured to self-sacrifice to go on paying for such a spectacle out of its strenuous earnings? Could any Government survive it? Could any exchequer endure it?

No State, however Socialistic, has yet consented to such a burden. On the contrary, Mr. Pember Reeves, in his evidence before the Committee of 1903, stated that there had been a very decided stiffening up in the application of the various tests and limitations contained in the New Zealand Pension Act. By that Act, as all the world knows, the pension is limited to people with an income of less than 10s. a week, though it is given with a reduction of one shilling for every shilling down to five shillings a week. The Act contains strict provisions against the collusive transfer of property to qualify for pensions, and against the transfer of aged parents on to the shoulders of the State by the well-to-do children.

Or, if we turn to Denmark, which has possessed a system of Old Age Pensions since 1891, we find that there is practically nobody in favour of abolishing the conditions under which pensions are given, and that the very rigid limits of income seem to be enforced without any practical difficulty. The proposals for reform do not take the shape of abolishing that limit, but of converting it from a vague instruction differently interpreted by local authorities into a fixed sliding scale.

THE CONDITIONAL SCHEME.

We seem then to be brought, as much by the experience of other countries as by our own "perpetual want of pence," down from the dizzy heights of a universal scheme to the more prosaic levels of the limited and conditional. We must turn our backs on the heroic. We must have the greater courage of facing the perils of the middle

course. Here, however slowly we move, our progress will be sure. We shall occupy the ground we conquer. For in those great matters, as Mr. Asquith shrewdly said in his 1907 Budget speech, "whatever is done must be done by steps and stages, and cannot be achieved "at a single blow."

But even if we agree to a conditional scheme, the further and more difficult question remains: what shall the conditions be? It is round that question that the fight will rage most hotly during next spring.

The schedule of conditions that for the moment "holds the field" is that laid down by the Chaplin Committee of 1899. That Committee put forward a scheme by which every person, 64 years of age, being a British subject, would be entitled to a pension if he could satisfy the pension authority that:—

- (a) He had not within the previous 20 years been convicted of an offence and sentenced to penal servitude or imprisonment without the option of a fine;
- (b) He had not received poor relief (other than medical relief), unless under circumstances of a wholly exceptional character, during 20 years prior to the application for a pension;
- (c) He was resident in the district of the pension authority;
- (d) He had not an income from any source of more than 10s. a week; and
- (e) He had endeavoured to the best of his ability, by his industry or by the exercise of reasonable providence, to make provision for himself and those immediately dependent on him.*

During the following year a Departmental Committee, under Sir Edward Hamilton, worked out in detail the cost of the Chaplin scheme at the various ages of 65, 70, 75 and 80, producing a valuable set of estimates as to numbers and cost.

Those estimates have now been brought up to date in the Local Government Board Blue-book, and will provide the country and the House of Commons with a sound and valuable basis for the coming discussions.

Suffice it to say here that a pension of 5s. a week given to old people in the United Kingdom at present living under the conditions of the Chaplin scheme would cost as follows:—

For those over 65	£10,780,000
For those over 70	6,119,000
For those over 75	3,033,000
Rising in 14 years to—	
Over 65	£12,004,000
Over 70	6,727,000
Over 75	3,465,000

* House of Commons Paper, 296, 1899. Report pars. 55 and 56.

Here we have figures which, for the first time in our argument, bring Old Age Pensions within the bounds of practical politics. It is now clear that with a quite feasible addition to the fund that he has already ear-marked, Mr. Asquith could easily provide in 1908 a "Chaplin pension" over 75, and, with very little financial difficulty, stretch his powers to 70.

But would a "Chaplin pension" meet the real need? Let us take the 1899 schedule of exceptions and examine it a little more closely. Here is another useful table provided by Mr. Burns, showing how many persons over 65 would have been excluded in 1907 from pensions by Mr. Chaplin's conditions:—

I. Classes disqualified for pension:—

	1901.	1907 (estimate).
(a) Persons with income of more than 10s. a week	741,998	778,283
(b) Persons who have received poor relief within the specified time	515,694	541,682
(c) Aliens (not British subjects)	32,043	33,661
(d) Persons convicted of an offence within the specified time		
(e) Lunatics		
(f) Persons barred out by the thrift test	72,798	76,185
Total disqualified for pension	1,362,533	1,429,811
II. Residue of possible pensioners ...	656,183	686,456

Thus of the total number of 2,116,267 British persons over 65 estimated to be living in 1907, only 686,456 would have been eligible for the Chaplin pension. In other words, the pension would reach, under the Chaplin conditions, less than half of the 1,337,984 estimated in the above table to be living on incomes of less than 10s. a week. That is not a very satisfactory result.

THE CRIMINAL AND PAUPER TESTS.

Let us take first those points in the Chaplin Schedule on which we shall most easily agree. There will, I take it, be no difference of opinion as to the exclusion of aliens and lunatics. Aliens have not earned the pension, and lunatics are otherwise provided for. We shall be equally agreed as to the desirability of excluding criminals at present in prison. Not even the extreme Socialistic wing has yet suggested a periodical distribution of pensions in all His Majesty's gaols. Finally, we shall be scarcely less unanimous that those who are actually receiving poor relief must be excluded from pensions.

People cannot have it both ways. Neither a man nor a woman can be permitted to be both a pauper and a pensioner at the same time.

But now we reach a much more difficult class of questions. How far shall the criminal and pauper tests be retrospective? Granting that you must exclude ticket-of-leave men and notorious "Recidivists," who would pursue their profession with the help of a State pension, are you to exclude all who have ever entered a prison? Perhaps the best solution has been found by the Australasian Colonies in a clause which fixes a proportionate time-limit of qualification for criminal offences—twelve years for short imprisonments and twenty-five years for penal servitude. This is a slight variant on the Chaplin test, which, on the whole, it is better to retain in some form. The possible loss of a pension might act as a deterrent to crime, and the exclusion of the criminal taint would certainly add to the social prestige of the pension.

The pauper test is much more difficult. The Chaplin bar against all paupers who have received poor relief during twenty years "unless under circumstances of a wholly exceptional character" is a little vague; but it has been estimated by the Local Government Board to mean an exclusion of 541,682 old persons. That is a very large number, and it probably includes a vast mass of the very persons who would most need a pension. The premium in avoidance of relief between 45 and 65 would doubtless effect some Poor Law saving, but, on the other hand, the very persons whom we want to transfer from the Guardians would still be left in their hands. The Friendly Societies might be moved to a subsidiary effort to tide over the difficult period between 55 and 65. But in many trades work is now over by 50, and it would be both cruel and stupid to exclude those who had accepted poor relief while waiting for a pension. Here, again, probably the best way out will be found in limiting the exclusion to persons proved to have led a life of chronic pauperism or deliberate vagrancy. But the test must always be laid down by Parliament in the most distinct and definite manner, and as little as possible left to the caprice of the pension authority.

It is precisely this objection that makes the thrift test practically unworkable. Something might be done by official regulations; but the question of what is a "reasonable providence" in the life of the working-man is one of those very delicate and inquisitorial ethical points that ought not to be left to the pension authorities if we wish them to be radically different from the Bumbles of the past. The Australian laws contain no such provision, and Denmark has found its tests of character very difficult to enforce. If we are to regard a pension as a "civil right" rather than as a "charity" we must follow the general law of assuming the fairness of the claim in the absence of any distinct anti-social disqualification. The Local Government Board calculates that 76,185 would be bowled out by the thrift test. But it is probable that the number would be much greater if it were at all strictly enforced.

THE INCOME TEST.

We come last to the test of income, which is calculated by Mr. Burns to exclude 778,283 old persons—a very tempting reduction for any Chancellor of the Exchequer. This test of income, roughly at 10s. a week, has been applied with success in New Zealand, New South Wales and Victoria, and is enforced at an even lower point of income in Denmark. It is necessary, however, to tread carefully when one is faced by the deliberate and almost impassioned opposition of so great a social thinker as Sir Charles Booth. But it is to be noted that though Sir Charles Booth saw every possible objection to an income limit, he proposed to arrive at the same end by his system of distributing pensions. His method was to enforce a very strict weekly attendance of pensioners. He estimated that the resulting abstentions of the well-to-do would effect a saving of fully 15 per cent., or, in other words, 3 millions out of the 19 millions which in 1899 seemed necessary for a universal scheme. It is really very doubtful whether this saving could be effected. We can imagine associations of well-to-do rate-payers living in a London suburb who would swear a solemn oath to apply for their pensions week by week. There arises before us a vision of newspaper agitation and organisation, presided over by pensioned peers of the realm, who would draw the last penny of this weekly dole. Surely, if the well-to-do are to be kept out at all, it would be better to do it in the honest Australian method. Sir Charles Booth's 19 millions has now risen to 27 millions, and would rise to 30 millions by 1921.* As we have seen, such sums represent a proposal fit only for the Greek Kalends. In the present state of the national finances, it is really not a practical suggestion that the British Treasury, with the myriad demands on its resources, should endow the aged well-to-do. The question before us is really whether we shall all go on expressing platonic affection for a universal scheme which has to be indefinitely postponed, or whether we shall accept the limited scheme which may become immediately operative. Are we to sacrifice another generation of the really destitute poor to a theoretical affection for the rights of the well-to-do?

Sir Charles Booth was deeply impressed with the difficulties of applying this test, but since he wrote (in 1899) we have learned more of the experience of Australia and Denmark, and there the difficulties seem to have vanished before resolute administration. There has been far less difficulty than many have imagined in discovering the incomes or preventing evasion.† Such difficulties, as we all know, have a way of vanishing if it is fully understood that they must be tackled.

* See p. 15 Blue Book (C.D. 3618).

† See the evidence of Miss Sellers and the Hon. W. Pember Reeves before the 1903 Committee. New Zealand has passed a special law to prevent old people from transferring their property to their children.

We behold now a public department in our own country successfully overcoming the difficulty, hitherto pronounced insuperable, of distinguishing between earned and unearned incomes. As a matter of fact there are no incomes more easily discovered than those of old men and women who have retired from work; and it is quite clear that any possible pension scheme must be confined to those who are retired from work. Here, as in other pension countries, there would be considerable hesitation in making false statements which, if detected, would be followed by loss of pension and prosecution; and as to the administrative difficulties, what would be the use of the Pension Commissioners whom we shall be compelled in any event to appoint, if they could not settle such problems as these?

We are told that if we apply the test of income we are destroying the idea of a civil right. But surely the civil right involved is not the right to receive so much money at a certain age, a right which only needs to be stated to be seen to be absurd. It is the right of a good and industrious citizen to be saved from destitution that arises from no fault of his own, and is due to age alone—and to be saved from it in a manner which shall not only be free from shame, but shall bring with it, by the very gift of a pension, some feeling of self-respect. Perhaps the most satisfactory feature in the evidence from Denmark is that the Old Age Pensioners in that country regard themselves and are regarded as quite distinct from the paupers.

Then it is urged that the income test would result in a discouragement to thrift. "If I save up to 10s. a week," the man in the street is supposed to argue, "I shall lose my pension—hanged if I save a shilling!" But it is precisely our case that the persons whom we want to benefit practically do not at present save for old age at all. It is even agreed that such funds as are devoted to old age by Friendly Societies and Trade Unions would be far more usefully devoted to the infirmities of an earlier age. The person who saves 10s. a week for old age is precisely the person who, by all English traditions and sentiments, would not take an Old Age Pension. The particular form of English pride that keeps a man from sending his children to the already free and admirable State-supported schools will be still quite strong enough to keep him from rushing into extravagance in order to qualify for a pension. Though far above the pauper, the pensioner will still be on a lower social scale than the person with a competence, and the social scale will still count.

An even more convincing answer to this difficulty comes from the pension countries that possess an income limit. Whether we take Germany, Australia or Denmark, the answer is the same. Thrift, instead of vanishing before Old Age Pensions, has actually increased. There has been more money placed in the German Savings Banks since 1891. The Australian Royal Commission reports the same of

the pension-giving Colonies. Lastly, the pension system in Denmark has been followed by a great increase of saving for sickness. Now, if our pensions should lead to a definite increase of sickness and invalidity insurance, then we shall have no mean gain!

To sum up, then, the modifications that seem necessary in the Chaplin schedule:—

(1) The excluded paupers will be limited to those who are actually receiving poor-relief, or have been for a certain fixed number of years able-bodied paupers or deliberate vagrants.

(2) The excluded criminals will be limited to those who have suffered a short term of imprisonment during (say) twelve years before applying, or suffered five years' penal servitude during twenty-five years before applying.

(3) The thrift test will be abolished altogether.

These modifications would mean, of course, a considerable addition to the number of pensioners, and therefore to the cost of the scheme. The number excluded under the pauper-test would probably be greatly reduced, and would progressively diminish as the outdoor aged poor were transferred to the Pension Fund. The only paupers on whose exclusion we could count with any confidence would be the 93,000 in our workhouses. The enquiries of the Local Government Board go to show that the great majority of these would remain where they are; at any rate, not enough would leave to affect indoor expenditure. But the drift into the workhouses would immediately be checked; and the relief of the poor rate in regard to outdoor relief would be so instant and substantial that the Government might reasonably ask for a corresponding local contribution towards their Pension Fund.

It would be impossible for an amateur to make any trustworthy reckoning of the changes of cost produced by these modifications. But we shall be on the safe side in estimating that even with these extensions, an Old Age Pension could be given to every qualified person over 65 for £13,500,000.*

If so much money cannot be obtained at once, there are many points on which saving can be made. Perhaps Sir Charles Booth's suggestion of beginning with the women would place too great a strain on male self-sacrifice, though it would be an impressive demonstration of national chivalry in face of the suffragettes. But the great thing is not to increase the qualifications. It would be better to make a beginning at 70, or perhaps at some point between 65 and 70. A certain discretion as to the amount of pension could be given to the Commissioners. Where husband and wife were living together, frequently a pension of 4s each would suffice. Last, but not least, a

* Reckoning £3,500,000 for the additional 76,000 released from the thrift test, 10,000 from the criminal test, and a possible 250,000 from the pauper test.

considerable saving ought to be made by the exclusion of those who already receive pensions of some kind or another from public or private sources, a body amounting in number, according to the Blue-book figures, to 249,213 in all. By all these means, it ought not to be difficult to bring the sum required down to £10,000,000.

Even so, how is that sum to be raised?

Mr. Asquith, as all the world knows, has already ear-marked £2,250,000 from licenses and other revenue. It would be perfectly fair to add to that at least £1,000,000, rising gradually to £3,000,000, which will be saved from the poor rates by the gradual cessation of outdoor relief. That could be deducted, as Sir Charles Booth suggested in 1899, from the local grants in aid, and might be made part of the new revision of our Local Taxation Account promised by Mr. Asquith last year.

That brings the sum still required from taxation down to £6,750,000.

THE REVENUE ALTERNATIVES.

Here we are faced with two alternatives. We may raise this sum in one of two ways: by a tax on the rich or a tax on the poor. In the first case, Mr. Asquith could get it by applying the super-tax on all incomes over £5,000 proposed by the Income-tax Committee* and taking another £1,000,000 out of death duties—probably as much as they will bear. In the second case he would raise it by the simple process of putting another halfpenny Excise duty on sugar.†

Those who favour the first course argue that Old Age Pensions are a debt from the rich to the poor, and that the rich are still insufficiently taxed in proportion to the poor. Those who favour the second argue that by our income-test our pensions are to be limited to the poor, and that therefore the poor ought to pay for them. They can quote the example of Denmark, where Old Age Pensions are paid for by a tax on beer.

Probably a wise Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he wishes to build soundly, will not confine himself to either of these alternatives, but will throw the burden broadly over the whole of society. He will probably strenuously avoid connecting Old Age Pensions with any idea of a special burden either on rich or poor. It is not impossible that his final fiscal solution may be found in a tax on land, though there the local authorities would seem to have the first claims to relief. It is enough for our present purpose that we have here a sum that can be found without any impossible or extravagant claim on our financial resources.

Certainly, if the money can be found, it could scarcely be spent on a better purpose than laying the foundations of a sound pension system.

* Estimated to produce £5,000,000 (p. 226 of Income-tax Committee Report).

† The present $\frac{1}{2}$ d. on sugar raised in 1906-7 £6,177,953.

rigidly separated from the taint of our Poor Law, administered by State officials, and spent on exchanging the unhappy disfranchised old age of our paupers for a position of civic comfort, honour, dignity and independence.* The present state of affairs cannot go on. It is a scandal to a civilised nation. The shadow of an unhappy old age falls on the whole working-class of this country, blotting out the sunshine of hope and self-reliance. It darkens the most prosperous middle-age. It embitters the relations between parents and children. It sets the artisan class in the gloom of a permanent insecurity. The experience of the pension countries goes to show that this shadow can be removed. With a secure old age to look forward to, middle-age becomes tolerable. Instead of being a horrible prospect, the last years of life lie in front as a happy and serene time of rest, worth some effort to reach. To produce such an effect in this country would be no mean triumph. It would surely be no vain expenditure of public money, to be able to say to the aged British worker:—

Thy thoughts and feelings shall not die,
Nor leave thee when grey hairs are nigh
A melancholy slave;
But an old age serene and bright,
And lovely as a Lapland night,
Shall lead thee to thy grave.

HAROLD SPENDER.

* Of course a large number of old people will still be so helpless as to be obliged to go into the workhouse, which will then receive the pensions. But there will always be the right to stay outside, and there would be no reason why the pensioner living in a workhouse or a cottage home should not keep his vote.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.-

FINANCIAL CARES.

“**M**ONEY is a good soldier, Sir, and will on,” is a truer phrase to-day than it was when Shakespeare wrote it. Nowadays gold produces the principal forces that move nations and the world. In olden times much more depended upon intellectual and moral qualities, upon individual courage and statesmanlike foresight. To-day ideas are, so to say, common property; like the air we breathe they cost nothing. It is only the realisation of an idea that calls for the expenditure of hard cash. And as for individual heroism, the demand for it among latter-day nations has apparently fallen off almost as largely as that for Dutch bulbs, which once made and unmade the fortunes of thousands. It is worth noting that money possesses a property which also characterises chemical substances: you can increase its effect—say its helpfulness—by adding to its quantity; but only up to a certain point. Beyond that point its action is reversed, becoming destructive in lieu of constructive. Hence the most valuable mental and moral qualities of wealthy nations, as of wealthy individuals, are withdrawn from them by gold, as iron is attracted by a magnet. As wealth waxes, national vigour wanes. In this respect history is repeating itself to-day; the unequal distribution of riches is transforming the scene of the world's theatre perceptibly, and before the present generation will have completely passed away, this one factor will have considerably changed the face of Europe.

Three of the principal States of the Continent are just now making up their yearly accounts, and it is no exaggeration to add that financial cares of a pressing and irksome character are also absorbing the most powerful nation beyond the seas. France, Germany, Russia and Prussia are working hard at their annual estimates, and a glimpse at the various points of view from which they regard the task, and at the different objects on which they spend their actual and potential

earnings, is almost enough to enable one to gauge the trend of their policy and the condition of their national health. Indeed, the story of the rise of this nation and the decline of that could not be told more distinctly or more impressively than by the figures of their Budgets. Russia, for instance, is still seen to be battling vigorously with her internal foes, and endeavouring at the same time to extricate herself from the chaotic welter into which she fell three years ago. Failure of crops, increase of drunkenness, the disappearance of her fleet and the endeavour to infuse new life into her Army are among the melancholy tales figured out in roubles and copecks by the facund Finance Minister, M. Kokofftseff.

Germany's Budget tells a different tale: national prosperity on the one hand, and national ambition on the other; an appetite for power and possession which has not yet been satisfied, and extraordinary liberality in catering for it. Before the Reichstag, which met on 22nd November, two thick volumes were laid, containing the credit and debit sides of the Imperial administration, followed by a third volume, which enables one to form an accurate idea of the cost of the colonies. Both columns of figures run parallel for a while, and then converge in the word "deficit."

France's Budget is interesting from the social as well as the political point of view. Cheerful reading for individual citizens of to-day, who are solicitous for State encouragement in their life-struggle and comfort in their old age, it is the writing on the wall for the France of light and leading, to which we in England were accustomed to look for new ideas and sanative principles ever since the Great Revolution. Frenchmen of the twentieth century appear to have made up their minds to live almost as though the nation must die with them, regardless of the claims of coming generations. The population may dwindle until France is a third-class Power, they will contribute nothing to prevent it, but at least they will see that those who do form part of the nation shall enjoy a fair share of the good things going. There is to be solicitude for the well-being of the voters, but no sentimentality about the nation, no painful sacrifices for coming generations, for charity begins at home.

THE DECAY OF FRANCE.

It is now admitted on all hands that the relative decrease of the French population is calculated to change very sensibly what used to be known as the balance of power. Positive decrease there is none as yet, seeing that the births are still in excess of the deaths, but the difference between the two is become insignificant, and the population manifests a uniform tendency to decrease. For example, in the year 1906 the number of persons born was greater than the total of those who died, by 26,651. But then in Germany the

balance to the good was no less than 800,000. In Austria and Great Britain the gain was 500,000, and in Russia it amounted to 2,000,000. France's increase is thus seen to be very slender as compared with that of her neighbours, and, to make matters worse, it is likely to become smaller still. It is difficult to avoid this cheerless conclusion, if we bear in mind that the average annual excess of births over deaths during the past ten years has amounted to 56,464. Consequently, last year the rate of increase was less than that average by over 100 per cent. Under these circumstances, the unemotional statistician, appealing to inexorable economic and other laws, foretells for the near future an excess of deaths over births, and the beginning of the end of a nation which has played a prominent part in the history of the world.

There would, perhaps, be some grounds for hope if the death-rate were abnormally great, and left a margin, part of which might by dint of precautionary measures be reclaimed. But, unhappily, such is not the fact. If it were, the number of new-born children who swelled the columns of mortality would be abnormally great. Russia is a striking example. There the number of infants who die during the first couple of years is appalling, but by the time the births show a falling-off, sanitary science will be in a position to keep down the percentage of infant deaths. But latter-day France has no such source to draw upon. Infant mortality on the other side of the Channel is already reduced to a minimum, and is relatively less than in other countries. Neither can French patriots set down the low birth-rate as a result of the small number of marriages, and entertain a reasonable hope of seeing that defect gradually remedied. The marriages are not abnormally few, and they have been increasing of late. Last year the number of matrimonial unions was uncommonly great; in fact, they not only exceeded the average but were not surpassed by the totals recorded during any one year since 1877. Still, from this quarter there might perhaps be some room for improvement, when we reflect that most of the couples are described as no longer young, and their marriages as marriages of reason. That state of things is capable of betterment, but how, and by whom? Three is the average number of children to a marriage in France. The fourth child is what the nation wants, and is likely to want in vain, because the cause of its absence is economic, and among individuals egotism is stronger than patriotism.

French people are heavily taxed, not only by the State, but also by the city or town, and the taxes are so distributed that they fall heaviest on large families. Children are thus forcedly included in the category of luxuries which only the well-to-do are willing or able to pay for. The house-tax, for instance, makes no allowance for a numerous progeny, so that the father of a large family who needs a more spacious dwelling is taxed more heavily than his neighbour

who has but one or two children to lodge. The incidence of many other indirect taxes tends in the same direction, and compels people who are wont to count up in advance the cost of living with the accuracy of a book-keeper, leaving nothing to Providence or to chance, to regard children as an expensive luxury. The results are visible to all. The historian may recount the story of France's decay without a word of regret, but patriotic Frenchmen might, with advantage to their country's cause, remember the vast sums expended by the State in improving the breed and keeping up the various races of horses, cattle, sheep and fish, and might ask themselves whether perpetuation of the race of men that gave St. Bernard, Montaigne, Molière and Victor Hugo to the world is not worth similar solicitude and equal sacrifices. The money that goes to the encouragement of horse-breeding, cattle-breeding and pisciculture is drawn largely from the pockets of those courageous individuals who are not afraid of a large family. For they are the caryatides of the financial fabric of the Third Republic, which has forgotten the inner meaning of the words: "Are ye not of more value than many sparrows?"

FRANCE'S CULTURAL INFLUENCE ON THE WANE.

The Budget in France is enormous; and, unlike the population, it is not stagnant. For 1908 the estimates are not far removed from four milliards of francs, or, say, one hundred and sixty millions sterling. And the chances that expenditure will be cut down in the near future are as slender as the chances that the birth-rate will go up. The reason is that in the latter case the taxpayers refuse to provide for children to come, and in the former case they are eager to make ample provision for themselves, when they are old and unable to work. Old age pensions, relief for maimed workmen, and similar measures of assistance for the living will swallow up vast sums, which it will tax the ingenuity of finance ministers to mobilise. As for the unborn, it is perhaps natural enough that the State should be on the side of the living: *les absents ont toujours tort*. Otherwise something might be undertaken on behalf of those future generations, who are sleeping partners, as it were, in the national business of the French nation. It is worth noting that a Commission was appointed, under the Waldeck-Rousseau Cabinet, to investigate the whole subject of the decrease of the population, and to concert measures by which it might be stayed. All aspects of the subject were studied closely, and voluminous materials gathered together which enabled the members of the Commission to make a number of practical suggestions, with a view to mitigate the evil. What will strike outsiders as amazing is the circumstance that the labours of this Commission have not been read by the people's representatives, because the Republic was unable to afford the money necessary for

printing them. No funds to print materials of this importance can be found in a land which has a Budget of nearly four thousand million francs!

After this it is not surprising to learn that the cultural influence of France, who a hundred years ago occupied the first place among nations, is rapidly diminishing. Take the French tongue as an illustration. Formerly one-third of the civilised peoples of the world expressed their thoughts in the language of Voltaire and Bossuet. To-day only fifty millions look upon French as their native tongue, and of these a considerable percentage are Belgians, Swiss, Canadians, Creoles. English has now taken the foremost place, and even German, which is spoken by one hundred and fifteen millions, leaves France far behind. Indeed, one of the most significant comparisons one could make to-day is that between France and her whilom enemy, Germany, from whom the French people of thirty-seven years ago hoped they would one day be able to wrest the lost provinces. France has now a population of thirty-nine millions, while Germany's citizens number sixty-two millions. And it must be gall and wormwood to patriotic Frenchmen to reflect that part of the overflow population of Germany, as well as of Italy and Spain, finds a refuge in France, occupying there the places that ought of right to belong to the offspring of French parents. The seaboard of the Mediterranean is slowly becoming defrancised. Already Algeria is more Italo-Spanish than French. Languedoc, from Nîmes to Perpignan, is invaded by Spaniards from Catalonia. Italians have found a home in the country between Marseilles and Vintemille, while the winter resorts of the Cote d'Azur are the haunts of flaxen-haired Teutons. The French must console themselves as best they may with the old age pensions and maimed workmen's state relief, late marriages, and the reduction of obligatory military service to a minimum which competent critics consider inadequate to the requirements of national defence.

THE FRENCH ARMY IS INEFFICIENT.

When the efficiency of the Army begins to be sacrificed to a natural love of ease and comfort on the part of citizens, the fifth act of the drama—French Nationalists declare—cannot be very far off, nor is it difficult to divine its character. A debate arose lately in the Chamber of Deputies which threw a melancholy light on the outlook. A proposal had been made to let the reservists and territorial troops off part of the time which they are annually obliged to give to military instruction. In future they are to sacrifice only twenty-seven days a year instead of forty-one. The question arose in connection with the War Office estimates, and the object aimed at was, say the Nationalists, to placate the taxpayer, who still bears a grudge against the Deputies for suddenly raising their own salaries from nine to

fifteen thousand francs. All the best military authorities condemned the proposal as most dangerous. The War Minister also endeavoured to dissuade the Chamber from striking this stunning blow at the strength and efficiency of the Army, declaring that any curtailment of the drilling of the reservists was a destinal weakening of the national defence. But the Minister confined his opposition to words. He did not confront the Chamber with the alternative of his own resignation. And so the blow to the Army was duly dealt. And besides shortening the annual instruction for the two classes of troops, the deputies struck ninety million francs off the military budget over and above. What, one may pertinently inquire, do the French Deputies rely upon? Their two years' military service law produced a deficit of almost 50,000 men. Their field artillery is notoriously defective. The skeleton units are numerous, and meanwhile Germany is waxing more and more powerful on land and sea. Does the French Chamber believe, in a special providence for the Third Republic, or is the French people ready to content itself with a quiescent *rôle* among the nations? When a serious conflict *à la* Morocco next arises between France and Germany, it is doubtful whether the Republic will be able to settle it on such easy terms as those agreed on at the Conference of Algeçiras. Diplomatic prestige follows military power. Diplomats and negociators usually speak with the voices of their respective countries' armies, and that of the Republic will probably be shrill and thin. Alliances, too, it should not be forgotten, depend for stability and efficacy on the readiness of each ally to take the field, unless, indeed, the arrangement belongs to the category of relations which are either benevolent, or else have been entered into for the attainment of some more far-reaching end, as, for instance, the interposition of the Russian Tsar, Alexander II., when Prince Bismarck was about to arrange a second Franco-German War. Russia's present relations with France are not of that benevolent order. They are shaped and limited by one set of considerations which draw Russia towards France, and by another set of motives which tend in an opposite direction. And if the relative strength of these political forces is no longer what it was, can Frenchmen greatly wonder?

GERMANY'S OUTLAY, AND WHAT IT PURCHASES.

One may entertain friendly or hostile feelings towards Germany, according to the dictates of reason or the promptings of prejudice, but one cannot refrain from admiring the bright example she sets of patriotic striving and self-abnegation. Germany's citizens feel themselves units of a great community, and are capable of offering up their own interests—or, at any rate, sacrificing part of them—for the good of the nation. Their money and their lives are at the

service of the Empire. Industry and commerce have brought them wealth and ease, but they have not yet yielded to the temptations that prosperity brings with it. Is money needed to sharpen the military sword in the hands of the State? The Government receives a blank cheque from the people. Is a navy deemed indispensable to the efficacious pursuit of a spirited foreign policy? Once the nation is convinced that the Government is right, the millions are forthcoming. Hence, although German trade and industry are flourishing and profitable, the Budget betrays a constant tendency to grow, and the National Debt grows with it. Thus the amortisation of the Public Debt, promised ten years ago, has not yet been carried out. A deficit of at least a hundred million marks is expected next year, and increased taxation, as well as a loan of 260 millions, must supply the means of covering it. Last October the Imperial Debt was computed at four milliard marks, or, say, two hundred million pounds sterling. The estimated extraordinary expenses, of which the marine absorbs several million marks, do not alarm politicians, although in all they amount to a quarter of a milliard of marks. What are much more disquieting are the items of ordinary expenditure, because they are stable. Among these the needs of the Army, unlike those of the French Republic, receive an increase of thirty-three million marks, the navy twelve millions, etc. This increase, which will be chronic, will have to be provided for by increased taxes, which will also be chronic. Whether a new spirit monopoly or a cigar tax be chosen is a matter of interest only to the German tax-payers. The lover of peace, who would gladly discern signs of the arrest of the ruinous race of armaments, has to register the unpleasant fact that, despite the weakening of France's defences, the more friendly relations alleged to prevail between Great Britain and Germany and the disablement of Russia, the Kaiser's Government continues to increase the sums allotted annually for the sea and land defences of the Empire. With the best will to accept the peaceful assurances of the German Press, given during the Kaiser's recent sojourn in England, one cannot avoid the conclusion that the scale on which war preparations are conceived and carried out in Berlin is far too great for purposes of defence against any unprovoked attack which Germany can possibly have to repel. In any case, the British tax-payer will now be compelled by the policy of Prince Bülow and his Imperial master to contribute more liberally than heretofore to national requirements which, keeping pace with those of Germany, bid fair to increase year by year.

"MOROCCO" AGAIN.

Since the recent Franco-German conflict the Morocco question is become perennial, and its issues extend over a considerable portion of

the globe, so that France's civilising mission among the Moors bids fair to abound in work of an uphill character. An attack on a French frontier post, followed by an invasion of French territory, is the latest development in that interesting part of the world. As, however, General Lyantey has driven back the raiders, inflicting severe losses on them, the matter is patched up—for a time. The incident is of little importance in itself; but its ultimate character, and whether it is typical of other incidents to come, depend upon the construction put upon it in certain of the Foreign Offices of Europe. And they are unknown. Encounters of this kind are sure to be frequent, seeing that France and Morocco are coterminous for a stretch of 1,200 kilometres, unless the natives have the fact brought home to them that they cannot look to any dissident Power for help or encouragement. Germany's view will, of course, interest the world, that longs for peace, more keenly than that of any other nation. And, judging by Prince Bülow's recent utterances in the Reichstag, one cannot do better than suspend one's judgment. On one or two points he left no doubt: he disapproved certain aspects of France's activity at Casa Blanca, and he confirmed the warning given by the Berlin Press that the damages which German subjects claimed would give rise to discussion in the near future. Surprise which can hardly be termed pleasant was also provoked by a curious little phrase of his, which, considering the care bestowed by the present Imperial Chancellor on his every public utterance, is well worthy of notice. Germany, he stated—when the question arose whether war was brought within the sphere of probabilities by the Morocco dispute—Germany was as little disposed to levy war for Morocco as she had been for the succession to the Spanish Throne in 1870. Critics noticed and peace-lovers deprecated this allusion to a quarrel which did actually culminate in war, and of which history—whose spokesman on this occasion is Prince Bismarck himself—tells us that even if Germany had no inclination to force a war, she deliberately employed the most efficacious means of precipitating it. For it was Bismarck who tampered with the fatal telegram and imparted to it a form which bore but one interpretation—that of a challenge.

The Morocco question resembles that of the Spanish succession in this, that it was the effect, not the cause, of the bitter feeling between the German and the French Governments. Unless we realise this, we shall be liable to form an inadequate view of the political outlook in Europe in 1908. If the Morocco conflict were really what it seemed—a sincere effort by the Kaiser's Ministers to safeguard German interests—the Algéiras Conference would have closed the chapter. But the opinion expressed at the time in the *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW*, that between the seeming and the real causes of the Franco-German dispute there was a wide chasm, has since been borne out by facts. German interests in Morocco constituted but the medium through

which Germany's sentiments were expressed. Whether in this case "Germany" should be taken to mean the nation, the Imperial Government or the chief of the State is immaterial. Had war broken out, all three would have been one. And that war was in view has been implicitly admitted by the Chancellor. Under such conditions one is less surprised at Germany's resolve to make ready for such emergencies at heavy cost than at France's unwillingness to make the sacrifices that are needed in order to enable her army and navy to strike a decisive blow in her defence.

No part of the Imperial Chancellor's recent speech on foreign politics was listened to with greater eagerness than that in which he dealt with the alleged danger of war resulting from the friction between France and Germany, which was summarised by the word "Morocco." The ground for this interest lay in the belief, expressed by some and entertained by most of the Chancellor's audience, that the relations between France and Germany had undergone a profound and abrupt change; that having been excellent, they were suddenly marred, apparently by a well-meant attempt made by the Kaiser to improve them. Behind the hard facts is a fading background of mystery. His Majesty was desirous of meeting President Loubet in the Mediterranean; for various reasons his desire was not gratified, and the result was a recrudescence of bad feeling between the two nations. The Morocco question was then unrolled by Wilhelm II., M. Delcassé's departure from the Quai d'Orsay was demanded and obtained, the Algeiras Conference was insisted upon, Count Lamsdorff's dismissal was desired and carried, and Lord Lansdowne's retirement postulated. By whom and why? In the interests of the German nation? Or was it for a purpose less commendable and more narrow? Was the Chancellor the originator of this change of policy or merely the executor who was compelled to unsay a good deal of what he had said in public when approving France's privileged position in Morocco?

KAISER AND CHANCELLOR: DIVISION OF LABOUR.

It was when replying to these queries, which had been made chiefly by the Press, that Prince Bülow likened the political conditions of 1905 to those which obtained in 1870. Another admission which he made at the same time was that the presence of the Kaiser and President Loubet in the Mediterranean simultaneously had given rise to the wish that they should come together. But in that case it follows that the relations between France and Germany were excellent just then, far better, in fact, than they had ever been since the war. Otherwise, the interview would have been inconceivable. That being so, why did the projected meeting not take place, and was it hindered in order to wean the Kaiser from his own plans, and to subject the reciprocal

feelings of the two nations to a swift and radical change? And by what means was this sudden coolness transformed into such a degree of unfriendliness that war was on the point of breaking out? How did it come to pass that the Chancellor's lieutenant, Herr Holstein, was ousted from the Wilhelmstrasse when the Francophile policy was in the ascendant, and then coaxed back again when the Francophobe policy of Prince Bülow and himself had won the day? The answer to these queries would have thrown light on the fitfulness of the Empire's policy, which to be truly pacific should be stable and calculable, and it would also have enabled us to understand why the line of action officially ratified by the diplomatists of the Wilhelmstrasse is neither continuous nor calculable. But Prince Bülow volunteered no information on the subject. Maximilian Harden, one of Germany's best informed and shrewdest political writers, had already communicated what he knew about it, and according to his narrative, the Kaiser himself had woven the plan of conciliation. But who balked the Imperial scheme, very few persons can say with certitude. The current view would seem to be that the Kaiser having made known his desire to meet M. Loubet, and having waited in vain for the arrangement of preliminaries, lost patience, and abandoning the policy he had pursued for years, he swung over to the opposite extreme of feeling, substituting hostility for amity. It is also believed that this revulsion of feeling was foreseen and prepared for by the German Foreign Office.

A FRANCOPHILE KAISER AND A FRANCOPHOBE CHANCELLOR?

An ordinary foreigner, standing aloof alike from the personal discussion and from the weaving of the policy, can have at most impressions, not a grounded judgment. And one of these impressions, which has been uttered in many places and at many times, is that Germany's policy has been long characterised by deplorable fitfulness, and at a time when continuity was essential to peace. Another is that the Kaiser, who acts as Foreign Minister, has his own notions as to what policy is best for the Empire, and that they are sometimes identical with the well-thought-out plans of Herr Holstein and Prince Bülow; but that whatever view His Majesty may hold, and whatever step he may take, his Chancellor is ever ready to endorse the opinion, to soften down the words, or to neutralise the effect of the act. Prince Bülow is, so to speak, the gardener who lays out the beds, waters the plants and weeds the soil. The Kaiser scatters the seed, occasionally waters the ground, prunes the shrubs and makes suggestions. Lastly, among well-informed classes in central Europe the impression is widespread, that of the two concrete policies indicated by the two sets of conflicting acts which culminated

respectively in the wish for a meeting between Kaiser and President, and in the "Morocco" conflict, the former was the marred handiwork of the Kaiser, and the latter the successful result of the systematic endeavours of Prince Bulow. Of course, to neither personage does the epithet Francophile or Francophobe apply in its full sense, but only as a rough distinguishing label. The Chancellor and Herr Holstein have remained faithful to Bismarck's traditional policy—the isolation of France. The Anglo-French *entente* was consequently unwelcome to them in a supreme degree; so, too, was the continuance of the alliance between the Republic and the Autocracy. A resolute attempt to separate France from her allies,—not to safeguard German interests in Africa, which were not in jeopardy—was at once the real cause of the trouble and the steady purpose of the Chancellor. The Kaiser's aim had been to win over France and to enter Paris as a friend. Since the Algéiras Conference the isolation scheme has been pursued vigorously and, many politicians add, not altogether unsuccessfully. Thus in France and Holland I heard significant comments on the touching harmony displayed at The Hague Conference between Germany and Russia, while France remained out in the cold. Whether the undoubted facts which underlie this belief are also trustworthy symptoms of corresponding changes in the relations between France and either of her allies, it would be rash to say. The facts, however, are there, and several French deputies who are staunch friends of the Dual Alliance expressed a strong desire to learn the explanation of them.

EXTIRPATION OF PRUSSIAN POLES.

The kingdom of Prussia will probably meet the New Year in a less cheerful mood than the German Empire. For the latter State has effected a coalition of parties which will for a time at least follow the Chancellor's lead, whereas the Parliament of the former is manifesting a disposition to kick against the pricks. Prussian finances, too, are in an unsatisfactory state: a deficit has to be provided for, and yet, strange to say, the Government is making ready to spend no less than £17,500,000 in order to expropriate Polish landowners from Prussian Poland and to keep them out of their own country altogether. "Spoliation" is what the Poles term it, "political folly" and "injustice" are the names assigned to it by those Germans who think without bias and would govern without injustice, the classes represented by the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and the *Preussische Jahrbücher*. Prince Bülow's plan is to destroy utterly the Polish nationality on Prussian territory. He took over the task from his predecessors, who had tried and failed, and he hopes by reinforcing the means which they employed to score a success. A number of German citizens are to be empowered to select estates among those

now owned by Poles, to have them expropriated compulsorily, paying their owners full value, and then to sell or to let the land exclusively to Germans.

For twenty years a policy identical with this in everything except the compulsory expropriation has been persisted in, but the means at the disposal of the State were less considerable than they will be if this measure becomes law. Still, the Prussian Government boasts that by these means 1,000 square miles of Polish soil have become German. And it is true. The critics of the Government, however, while admitting this fact, point out that during the same time 1,200 square miles of German land have passed into Polish hands—a very satisfactory set-off for the countrymen of Sienkiewicz. It was bad business and worse policy, they maintain, to spend millions of marks in order to attain that result. And it would be a still greater blunder to waste seventeen and a half millions sterling in obstinately pursuing the same policy, at a period, too, when Prussia's finances call for retrenchment and other sanative measures.

One may grasp the significance of the new Bill by imagining Mr. Balfour applying to the House of Commons for powers to buy out Irish farmers compulsorily and forbid them ever again to own land or a house in the place. A German landowner who occupies an official position, and is one of the most respected landowners in Prussian Poland,* has published a booklet on the subject, which is likely to have a powerful effect upon the moderate German elements of the population. He denounces the policy as a violation of the Prussian Constitution, as a solvent of order, and a demoralising force calculated to drive the Poles into the Socialist or the Anarchist camp. "I call upon the whole civilised world," he writes "to pronounce its verdict on the case. Whoever fails to perceive in this a direct intentional curtailment of the equality of rights hitherto enjoyed by Prussian citizens of Polish extraction is, I maintain, devoid of a sense of justice."†

Whether the Prussian Landtag will confer upon the Government the extraordinary powers they ask for, may well be doubted. My belief is that it will. But much harm has been already done by the bringing in of the Bill. The two nationalities, which were already rendering each other's lives unpleasant, are now boycotting each other with intense bitterness bordering on aggressiveness. In the Austrian Parliament protests have been uttered, and Italians joined the Slavs against the Germans; in Russia sympathy with the Poles has also been freely expressed; in Warsaw the sale of German wares has fallen off; and in Posen proposals have been made that the Poles shall return Social Democrats to the German Reichstag.

* Paul Fuss. His pamphlet is entitled: "Die Zustände in der Provinz Posen."

† As a proof of the consideration enjoyed among his own countrymen by Herr Fuss, I may point out that Professor Delbrück quotes him extensively and with approbation in the last number of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*.

The philosophical, truth-seeking student of history, having set forth these facts without overstatement or bias, will pause to reflect on the universality and deep-rootedness of that form of racial or national self-assertion which goes by the name of Chauvinism. The Poles in Posen are oppressed by the Prussians with a degree of cold-hearted cynicism that arouses our indignation to the point of passion. Elementary justice is all the down-trodden people ask for, and they hunger and thirst for that. Having thus focussed our sympathies in the direction of the Poles, who are denied common justice by the Prussians, we are asked to let our sensibility be thrilled by the melancholy story of the Ruthenians of Galicia, whom the Poles are accused of oppressing in a way similar to that in which they themselves are treated by the Germans, and to anathematise in the Poles the incarnation of injustice. Again, who among us has not felt a thrill of enthusiasm at the mention of the chivalrous Magyars, whose gallant fight for freedom against Austrian despotism permeates us with a passionate conception of justice? And now we are dragged down from the heights of rapture by such friends of freedom as Björnsterne Björnson, who ask us to plead for the Slavonians, the Roumanians, the Croatians and the Germans on whom the hobnailed boot of the ruthless Magyar treads as though they were noisome vermin. For over ten years the civilised world has warmly upheld the cause of gallant little Finland against the Goliath Muscovy, and thanks largely to this generous support the machinations of General Bobrikoff have been baffled and the Finns saved from annihilation. And now an appeal has gone forth to the civilised world beseeching us to condemn the brutal Finns for using their new-gotten Home Rule to banish luckless Jews who had found a refuge in the Principality. One may truly say *tribus tribui lupus*. This and kindred reflections need not shake our faith in the future of the race, but they might fitly contribute to make us think about political subjects with less bias, speak without dogmatism, and prompt us, when assailing injustice and oppression, to reserve a space in our consciousness in which to inscribe, when we have discovered it, some creditable word or praise-worthy fact calculated to moderate our judgment of the oppressor, and to enable us to espouse his cause with sufficient warmth when he comes before us as one of the oppressed.

THE THIRD DUMA MAKES AN EXCURSION INTO CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

The Third Duma is already a month old, and has as yet done no work, has not even organised itself. *Festina lente* is evidently its maxim, with the accent on the second word. Debates there have been not a few; but they were as the noise of sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. The first discussion took place on the motion to

thank the Tsar for the October Manifesto, which created the Legislative Chamber. A great majority of the deputies—including the Constitutional Democrats, who are adjusting themselves to their environment—were in favour of expressing their gratitude, but they could not agree how to call the institution for which they felt grateful. Some wanted to name it a Constitution, others “a renovated order of things.” If it is a Constitution, then there is no Autocrat, the Octobrists argued, and consequently that title of the Emperor must be dropped. “If we are bent on thanking the Tsar,” replied the Conservatives, “let us do it with a good grace. Whatever name we may give to the present *régime*, the title of the ruler has undergone no change. He was an Autocrat when he ascended the throne, and he is an Autocrat to-day. Proofs? They are as plentiful as blackberries. For example, the Organic Laws which we have all sworn to obey consecrate that title. Then again the solemn promise which each of us signed, and which takes the place of an oath of allegiance, calls the Monarch an Autocrat, and none of us has raised any objection. There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt as to what we should do.”

But the Constitutionalists—and among them the Octobrists favoured by M. Stolypin—insisted. “By the Manifesto,” they argued, “the Tsar limited his authority and curtailed his prerogatives. Thus it is no longer in his power to issue laws without the approval of the Duma; neither can he abrogate any of the Organic Statutes.” “You are mistaken,” answered the Monarchists. “Have the Organic Statutes not been already altered? Has the ‘immutable’ electoral franchise not been changed? Would the members of the Third Duma be here if the Autocratic power had not been resumed last June and wielded for the good of the country? And the causes which provoked its action then may set it moving again. Let us follow the example given by the ruler and act in lieu of talking.” But the Octobrists stood their ground, and the address was voted with a flaw in the Tsar’s title. That was the work of one whole day and part of a night—an unlucky day—the 13th November Russian style. In this way the Duma offered the Sovereign a pot of honey mingled with wormwood. The Premier was upset, the Tsar offended, and the Monarchists indignant. “This, then,” the Monarchists exclaimed, “is M. Stolypin’s Duma, the areopagus which is to prescribe remedies for the Russian nation now at death’s door?”

VIVE STOLYPIN!

Three days later came the Premier in a *quos ego* mood. And he was at his best. Ever since his first appearance as a public orator, M. Stolypin has kept the high place he then won. His eloquence, like

his character, is manly, and his utterance impressive. His look, his accents, his gestures, betoken sincerity, and his manner is warm with the heat of subdued enthusiasm. On this historic day he simply electrified the House, captivated his adversaries, and extorted applause from his bitter enemies. And yet he was battling with the Duma, swimming against the current. He spoke of the Autocratic power and of the Autocratic Sovereign, and had the satisfaction of being interrupted by enthusiastic cheers. Later on he was insulted by a prominent Constitutional Democrat, M. Rodicheff, who invented a nickname for the present system of Government, and hoped to have it sanctioned by the Duma. So frequent are cases of capital punishment, he said, that the system of government will be known as that of "Stolypin's necktie." But never was a man more disappointed in his audience. His words unchained a veritable tempest. A wild rush was made for the offending orator, who stood at the tribune ashy pale. Monarchists smashed their desks with their bare hands, which they had to carry in slings for several days afterwards. One of their leaders snatched a tumbler and was about to hurl it at the head of the offending member, who was ultimately taken away by a friend. The Premier then sent a couple of Ministers to M. Rodicheff to say that he expected an apology at once, the alternative, which was understood, being "satisfaction in the traditional way." Without hesitation the Cadet orator went to the Prime Minister and took back his words in the presence of witnesses. He next made a public apology to the Duma and was then expelled for two months. That memorable sitting was wound up with hearty cheers and loud applause for the Premier.

Happily, M. Stolypin is a man of steadfast purpose rather than brilliant intellect, for his moral qualities may stand him in better stead, during the revolutionary crisis, than would rare mental gifts. At bottom his temper is Liberal rather than Conservative, and mainly for that reason he would seem to have been chosen to be sexton of the old epoch and harbinger of the new. Hence his first care was to bury the ancient *régime*, until ruler and ruled perceived to their surprise that it was not dead, but only stunned. And that apparently was the fact that he implicitly acknowledged in the Duma when he spoke of the Autocratic Tsar. He has but adjusted himself to the new condition of things, and is painfully surprised to learn that the public holds him guilty of trimming. In the people's imagination, which so often distorts motives and garbles facts, it is assumed that he has not quite successfully resisted the tremendous pressure to which his position subjected him. This no doubt is mere calumny. M. Stolypin has in truth modified his views, as do most men when in power. For one thing, he now possesses more data to guide him than before, and for another he sees more clearly the limits of the feasible,

which are often narrower than they appear to outsiders. But when everything has been said and weighed, the fact remains that the Prime Minister is a convinced Liberal.

STOLYPIN'S SERVICES TO LIBERALISM

No fair-minded man can doubt the sincerity of M. Stolypin's Liberalism. It has withstood the test of time and the pressure of unfavourable circumstance. His faith in Liberal specifics is so firm that he declines to diagnose any diseases that call for more drastic remedies. Thus when the civil war might presumably have been ended by a *coup d'état* (which in any and every case had to come), he refused to have recourse to it until the alternative was a national disaster. Again, one may admit the Premier's deferential respect for the Autocratic power without denying that his unswerving attachment to popular ideals has inspired a series of far-reaching Liberal measures, which, if the Second Duma had given him due support, would have brought Parliamentary government within sight and reach of the nation. Whether that would have been a blessing or a curse is not to the point: it constituted the avowed aim of the parties, which not only withheld their co-operation from the Premier but assailed him tooth and nail.

M. Stolypin is at present the only influential politician in Russia who is working efficaciously for the Liberal cause. He is systematically removing hindrances to Constitutionalism which are most formidable at the outset. He is winding up the old order of things and seeking to establish the new on a firm basis. To this end he is weeding out those tried and active servants of the Autocracy who are unable to spend the latter half of their lives in undoing the work of the former. In this way quite a number of Imperialists have been shelved without noise and almost without notice. The most powerful of these was the Comptroller-General, M. Schwanebach, a clever, consistent and proselytising Monarchist. This official was the only member of the Cabinet fitted to give the Emperor such advice as, if followed, might have procured a new lease of twenty years for firm Monarchist government. He was believed to be in favour of letting an interval of two years elapse between the Second Duma and the Third. It is known that during the most alarming crisis he never lost his head. When the Goremykin Cabinet was afraid to provoke a revolution by dismissing the first Parliament, M. Schwanebach gauged aright the effects of the dissolution, and proposed measures which were ample to neutralise them. Conversant with revolutionary history, he had an epigrammatic phrase for every event, and a French or German parallel for every phase of the Russian movement. The influence of such a man was a serious check on the Liberal Premier, who at last had him removed. And this was a clear gain for the Constitutionalists.

M. STOLYPIN'S SERVICES TO THE PROGRESSIST PARTY.

But the greatest service which any Minister could render a cause was performed by M. Stolypin for Liberalism at a time when it depended on him either to lay the groundwork for a Constitutional fabric or to establish firm Monarchical government. And for that service he deserves, and may yet receive, a public monument from Democratic Russia. He advised the Tsar to summon the Third Duma soon after the Second, and to issue no laws in the meanwhile. That was really the turning point in the history of Russia's Constitution, the *magnum opus* of M. Stolypin's political life. And he followed it up with a step more extraordinary and decisive still. He himself had recourse to the Autocratic power which it is the tendency of his policy to annihilate, and he used it for the purpose of destroying Autocracy. That surely was a *coup de maître* which entitled the Minister to the undying gratitude of all Liberal Russia. But not a Liberal uttered a word of thanks. This deadly blow was struck at the Autocracy in the following way.

The Electoral Law opened the portals of the Duma chiefly to Democrats and other irreconcilable enemies of the Monarchy, and so long as it remained in force, no Duma acceptable to the Government was possible. Yet it could not be abrogated. For together with the Organic Statutes it had been declared part of the unchangeable Constitution. The Tsar's hands, therefore, were tied, his word was pledged, and the result was a deadlock. Autocratic power could not be wielded anew without effecting a perilous *coup d'état*. Well, the Premier advised the Crown to seize once more the sword of the Autocracy, and with it to hew off the branch on which the Autocrat was sitting. That was the true significance of the measure against which the enemies of the Autocracy still cry out. For the object directly aimed at and immediately attained by this *coup d'état* was the creation of the Octobrist Party, whose first work in the Duma was to declare that the Autocracy had gone for ever.

THE THIRD DUMA IS VIRTUALLY A CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY.

If those Octobrists be now converted, as we are assured they have been, to the Conservative faith, it is evidently impossible that the Liberal Premier and the Arch-Liberal Cabinet should be able to co-operate with the Duma, which would then be Conservative. There must, therefore, be a change. And this necessity of harmonising the Cabinet with the Parliament is already exercising the ingenuity of patriotic citizens. It is a matter of life and death to Russians who love their country wisely. For the Third Duma—containing the best

men whom it is possible to bring together—is likely to live long, always provided that no terrific shock from without breaks it up. Consequently, it will shape the destinies of the nation for good or evil. For it will indirectly devise a form of government for Russia, by creating a number of political institutions which, if they be well thought out, will satisfy the people who desire social and political reform, and will also meet the requirements of the Russian nation, which are unique. The first step in this direction will be to frame a new electoral law. For as the Franchise is, so will the Parliament be, and a coherent rounded Electoral Law is needed which will keep out the oceanic violence of revolution as the system of dykes in Holland stops the inrush of the German Ocean. The present Franchise is a shabby legislative quibble unworthy of the great Russian nation.

Another of the problems, a solution of which will go far towards rough-hewing the fate of Russia, turns upon the relations of the race which built up the Empire towards the members of the other nationalities who are now their fellow citizens. It is a task that bristles with difficulties. Therefore, the utmost delicacy of touch is needed. Rancorous prejudices may easily be aroused by clumsy treatment, and a huckster's spirit may render short-lived a political community which should endure for centuries. And these are but two of a series of Herculean labours that must be taken in hand and completed before Russia can begin to lead a normal life again.

Constructive work of that character differs little from the labours of a Constituent Assembly, once the latter has selected its form of government, as the Third Duma during the debate on the Address would seem to have done. For that reason it would have been incomparably better had the present Parliament been confronted with a set of accomplished facts, instead of being empowered to create them. But this would have implied an interval of eighteen months or two years between the Second Duma and the Third. True, it was to the interest not only of the Monarchist Parties, but of strong government generally, that this course should be adopted. But although it may be assumed that the Crown discerned this fact clearly enough, it is known that the Liberal Premier declined to countenance any long interval between the two Parliaments, or any extensive use of the Imperial Prerogative. Hence for the Duma was reserved the honourable rôle of Constituent Assembly in its second stage.

WHAT REGIME IS BEST SUITED TO RUSSIA?

The devolution on the Duma of these important functions strikes a tremendous blow at the Monarchical cause. Autocratic government is eliminated at any rate for the time being. Between it and Russia stands the Duma, which exists with the assent of the Monarch, and will continue to exist until a Representative Chamber has come to be

an indispensable element of the Russian political system. But even if the way which is now blocked by the Duma were clear, it is doubtful whether an effort would be made to use it. Most probably not. Since the October Manifesto was issued two such opportunities have presented themselves, and each was allowed to slip away unutilised. Against a strong current Russian Monarchists do not seem able to swim. And that clinches the matter; for the first—and in latter-day Russia the only—condition of Autocracy is that there should be an Autocrat.

To object to any type of government in the abstract would be puerile. The suitability of a *régime* for a people is the only criterion reasonable politicians can acknowledge. Hence, in this case, the standard by which one should accept or condemn is the help or harm Russia may easily hope or fear from the establishment of this *régime* or that. And viewed through this light a Constitution in which the Cabinet is responsible only to the Parliament is held by many thoughtful Russians to be utterly unsuited to their people. Indeed, a more efficacious means of sapping the Russian State it would be hard to conceive. The reason is not far to seek. The Empire contains between 35 and 40 per cent. of non-Russian elements, most of whom are better educated and more thoroughly trained than the Russians. Hence in a Constitutional-State they would soon find ways and means of compelling the Government to grant them Home Rule, in some cases of a "personal union" type. What is meet for the Finn is fitting for the Tartar, the German, the Pole and the Georgian. And if the 35 per cent. of men of foreign extraction did not suffice to carry the point, they would be joined by a numerous contingent of Russians whose accession would turn the scale in their favour. Therefore, say Conservatives and Monarchists, Constitutional government must be eliminated. And if a Constitutional system like that of England or France be incompatible with Russia's integrity, so, too, is every form of government that leads directly to such a *régime*. The First and Second Dumas answered to this description, for they each contained a majority ready to vote for federation. And a like majority would probably be returned to-day if a General Election were carried out on the basis of Universal Suffrage, and after a vigorous electioneering campaign. Therefore the Franchise must be restricted.

RUSSIANS AND NON-RUSSIANS. CENTRIPETAL AND CENTRIFUGAL FORCES.

What patriotic Russians are now seeking to devise is a solid system of political administration which would strengthen the centripetal and weaken the centrifugal tendencies of the component parts of the Empire. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at if they repudiate Parliamentary government while approving representative institu-

tions. Foreigners generally endeavour to convert them to Parliamentaryism pure and simple. But they are inflexible. They feel the dangers that beset them, and a comparison of their resources with those of their adversaries convinces them that if they cede on the question of Constitution the cause of Russia, one and indivisible, is lost irretrievably. The case is on all fours with that of the British people who decline to be persuaded by telling arguments into sanctioning a tunnel between England and France. Russia's needs and aspirations—Moderate Conservatives affirm—which are the outcome of historical conditions wholly different from those of other people, require a very different set of political institutions. No type of government, therefore, will, they state, be sanctioned which will not constrain within reasonable limits the centrifugal activities which are a fertile source of danger to the State. In a matter which touches such sensitive interests as this, Russian and non-Russian had best be left to negotiate without interference from without.

But can a Liberal Cabinet be permitted to preside over the discussions and to carry on the negotiations by which those fateful problems are to be settled for good? This is the question of the moment. The Ministers have long since supplied specimens of their work, and it has failed to inspire confidence. Doubtless some of its members are, it is affirmed, characterised by a certain degree of elasticity.* Deputy-Minister Kryshanoffsky, for example, has been variously compared with Abbe Sièyes and the Vicar of Bray. He certainly worked zealously for several masters and in various styles, fashioning electoral laws of a strictly Conservative, a Moderate and a Radical type. The Minister of Public Instruction is another official who has been praised and blamed for his breadth of view. It was he who first publicly vindicated the majesty of the law which forbids the admission into universities and high schools of more than a small percentage of Jews, and then evaded it by means of a flimsy distinction. It was he, too, Monarchists complain, who heartily applauded the Premier for affirming that the Monarch is still an Autocrat, and who also wrote a celebrated letter declaring that Russia is already a Constitutional Monarchy.

So long as Russia was in dire distress, argue the Monarchists, all those petty expedients had to be tolerated. At present, however, a new leaf must be turned. Sincerity is the only quality that will wear well in an epoch of revolution. And sincerity cannot emanate from a Government consisting of a Liberal Cabinet pulling in one direction and inspiring a Conservative Parliament which pulls in the opposite direction. The first institution needful is a frankly Conservative Cabinet, which alone can lay the groundwork for a coherent system of

* One member of the Cabinet who is a frank Conservative and has never swerved from his principles is the Finance Minister, M. Kokofftseff. He would most probably retain his present portfolio in a Conservative Government.

strong government, capable of weathering the storms that are still gathering, and can provide the means of fusing into a political community, one and indivisible, the various peoples and tongues whose conflicting interests now render the existence of the Russian Empire precarious.

If the Third Duma is to discover and embody a new synthesis of national existence and individual liberty, of the rights of the people and the duties of the rulers, it can do this only in harmonious co-operation with a Cabinet which enjoys the full confidence of the majority. But the foreigner who seeks to form an approximately correct notion of Russia's present position and future outlook would do well to bear in mind the cardinal fact that the Duma is but a single factor of both. The others are many and even more important than the Chamber of Deputies. Thus the face of things may at any moment be radically changed by the success of one of the numerous plots that are being hatched every week, or by the successful criminal act of a fanatical bombist.

E. J. DILLON.

TARIFF REFORM METHODS.

THE Unionist Party appears to be living in a fool's paradise. Writers and speakers of recognised authority in the party vie with one another in talking of its brightening prospects and its assured future. The plain truth is that never has one of the great parties been in such a deplorable position since the Reform Bill of 1832. The catastrophe of the last Election was, in itself, unprecedented. Without any great constitutional change to account for it, the party in office was swept not only from power, but almost out of existence. It returned to the House of Commons with less than 160 adherents. Since that time upwards of 50 bye-elections have taken place, and the Unionists have won three seats, one in a three-cornered contest, where they did not poll a majority of the votes, a second, where local and personal causes made a victory for the Liberals almost impossible, and a third in Mid-Devon. At such a rate of electoral progress, the return of the Unionists to power must be indefinitely postponed. Nor is this the gloomiest aspect of the position. In most previous Parliaments the tendency has been for the party in office to fare increasingly badly at bye-elections. The wave of their popularity seemed to exhaust itself, and, as time went on, Ministerial candidates gained fewer victories at the polls, and suffered heavier defeats. In this Parliament, events, at first, followed their usual course. Until last summer, until, in fact, the close of the Colonial Conference and the recrudescence of the Tariff Reform movement which followed thereupon, the Unionist party appeared to be steadily improving its position. In the first six months of 1906, the three contests which took place in British seats which had been fought at the General Election showed that the Unionist majority, which had been 11,483 at the General Election, had grown to 12,411. In the next six months a similar Unionist minority of 9,459 had been reduced to one of 8,179. In the first six months of 1907, even excluding Wimbledon, a Unionist

minority of 10,704 had fallen to 4,086. So far, things had gone fairly well. In every one of the bye-elections except two, both of them three-cornered contests, the Unionists had gained ground. From July to December of last year there was a marked change for the worse. In the six closing months of 1907 there were six contested elections in Great Britain. Of these five took place in large industrial constituencies, and the sixth at Bury St. Edmunds. At Bury St. Edmunds alone did the Unionists do materially better than before. At Kirkdale and North-West Staffordshire the figures of 1906 were little changed, the balance of the two elections being against us. At West Hull the Unionist vote sank, both actually and relatively to the numbers polled. At Jarrow and Colne Valley, though no comparison with 1906 was possible, the Unionists polled in each case considerably less than one-third of the votes cast. Since then has come the Mid-Devon election. It may be the first symptom of a Unionist reaction, or it may not. Time will show. All that need be said about it here is that the result was in startling, if refreshing, contrast to the preceding electoral phenomena. Even granting that in rural constituencies, such as Brigg, Mid-Deyon, and, it may be, Ross, Tariff Reform has made progress, it remains true that, in the great industrial centres, whose support is essential to victory, there is no reason to think that the party stands any better than it did in 1906. It is true that the Liberals have achieved little more, if anything, than we have, and there are some Unionist Mark Tapleys who find consolation in that fact. It seems, however, poor comfort to a rejected suitor that the object of his affections, having thrown over his recognised rival, should turn to a third and hitherto despised aspirant. Personally I find no cause for self-congratulation in the discovery that there is a large body of voters who prefer a Labour man to a Liberal, and either of them to a Unionist.

In face of these facts it is, surely, carrying optimism to the verge of insanity to pretend that all is well with Unionism. It would be more useful to admit that the Unionist cause is far from flourishing, to ascertain the reasons for our unpopularity, and to search for a remedy. The quest is not an easy one. Voters do not give reasons for their votes, and no two observers at an election agree as to the motives of the electors. Some axioms may, indeed, be laid down. Enthusiastic meetings have no necessary relation to electoral success. On the other hand, very bad meetings do, as a rule, presage electoral defeat. I believe that no experienced electioneerer will dispute either of these propositions. Many illustrations of their truth could easily be given, drawn from the careers of great platform orators. Indeed, a moment's consideration will show that they must be true. In any centre of population

it is easy to fill a large hall with adherents of any cause, however generally unpopular, since the capacity of the hall bears a very small ratio to the size of the population. In a city whose inhabitants are numbered by hundreds of thousands there is no difficulty in finding a few hundred supporters of almost any recognised political opinion. And since free speech is traditionally respected in Great Britain, it is only when that tradition has been suspended by some exceptional condition, such as a spirit of reprisals or a wave of popular excitement, that the advocates of any cause are put to silence. If, then, public meetings have only a negative value as gauges of popular feeling, the returns of canvassers are not much more satisfactory. Few canvassers conceive it to be part of their duty to find out the opinions of the voters. It is much if they can be got to make any real inquiry as to their electoral intentions. Moreover, it is only thorough-going partisans who can be induced to go canvassing—and a thorough-going partisan is not a satisfactory searcher after truth. Perhaps the most trustworthy explanations of electoral phenomena are those which crystallise out of the general impressions of a number of observers some months after the events have taken place. Thus, few would now deny that the Election of 1900 turned mainly on the South African War. In the same way there seems a pretty general agreement that the "landslide" of 1906 was due to several causes. Different men assign different values to those causes according to their prepossessions. But most would agree that the electorate were moved partly by a general weariness of the Unionist administration—due to a variety of causes, including chiefly the length of their lease of power—and partly by such issues as those raised by the Fiscal Question, Chinese "Slavery," the Education Question, and the Trades Disputes Bill. There probably were other contributory causes of the Unionist disaster, but none of anything like the importance of those mentioned. If, then, we have failed to regain much of the favour of the electorate, to which, if any, of these causes must our failure be assigned? Clearly not to Chinese "Slavery." That specious calumny is laid to rest for ever. Nor can the Trades Disputes Question have any direct bearing on the present situation. With regard to the Education Question, it is difficult to believe that the voters are still so hostile to the Act of 1902, that they approve the egregious policy of Mr. McKenna and Dr. Clifford. Indeed, where the electors have had to consider that question uncomplicated by other political considerations, as in the local elections in Liverpool, in Swansea, in Lancashire, in the West Riding, and to some extent in London, they have shown themselves as hostile to religious persecution by the militant Nonconformists, as they were to what they conceived

to be persecution⁶ by the Church under the Act of 1902. The generalised unpopularity of the late Government may still be an effective electoral factor, though one would have thought that its virulence would have been modified by the lapse of two years, and the experience of their successors.

There remains the Fiscal Question, which is, of course, as acute as ever. Now, the present writer is one of those who believe that the unpopularity of Tariff Reform, identified in the public mind as it is with Protection and the taxation of corn and meat, is due to no passing phase of sentiment or opinion, but has its roots deep down in the social and industrial conditions of the country ; but whether that be so or not, it would probably be conceded by the most ardent Tariff Reformers that their policy has had to fight against circumstances which are no essential part of the policy itself. It is no doubt true that the charge that high sounding Imperial considerations have been used to mask rather sordid motives of self-interest has been freely and successfully used. However unjustifiable such a charge may be, it is one that was certain to be made against a policy of Fiscal change which found many of its advocates among the wealthier landlords and manufacturers of the country. But it derived quite fortuitous support from the fact that those foremost in urging Tariff Reform happened to be the same persons who were chiefly responsible for the South African policy against which unscrupulous politicians had made similar accusations. So, too, it was unfortunate that it fell to the party to which the Tariff Reformers belonged to advocate Chinese Labour and oppose the Trades Disputes Bill. On all these questions it was plausible to say that the Unionist Party had been captured by the capitalists, and that the policy they recommended on patriotic grounds was in truth the outcome of class interests of the narrowest character.

It has been said that most of these questions have now become matters of history. But the taint which they, in many respects quite unfairly, imparted to Tariff Reform still remains. Nor have the methods by which that policy has been pressed forward been calculated to remove it. A commercial atmosphere has infected the whole campaign. First came the "hustling" and the "booming," the purchase of newspapers, the utilisation for the purposes of political advertisement of the music hall and the stage. Then followed the astonishing disregard of accuracy in the use of figures, the unblushing appeals to the cupidity of localities, the exaggerated presentment of the dangers threatening British trade. Each of these weapons has in times past been used for political purposes. But I doubt if they have ever been used in this country so aggressively, or, if the word may be allowed, so transatlantically.

Nor have they stood alone. On the contrary, they have been accompanied by other proceedings of a still less defensible character. An organised attempt, crowned with a large measure of success, has been made to drum out of Parliamentary life all those Unionists who have been unable to accept the policy of Tariff Reform. In itself this procedure is as foolish as it is harsh. A political party is not an army. It cannot be marched and counter-marched at the will of its commander, still less at the will of a self-appointed Council of War. It is a voluntary association of persons holding similar views on certain political questions. It exists for the purpose of forwarding those views, and that is the sole bond which unites it. If, then, the majority of the party adopts a new policy which any members of it disapprove, or think inconsistent with other and more important party objects, the dissident members are entitled, and indeed bound, to say so. They have no right to put their political consciences into their party's keeping, and blindly to follow the lead of the majority. Nor is there any means in this country of compelling or inducing them to do so. Any attempt in that direction can only lead to electoral disaster. When, therefore, the Tariff Reform policy was suddenly launched, and even when some undefined fiscal change became part of the "official" policy of the party, it would have been wise as well as just to treat those who rejected this addition to the Unionist creed with the utmost forbearance and consideration. As a matter of fact a precisely opposite procedure has been pursued. Not only have some Unionists been driven from the party, and others from Parliament, but they and those that remain have been assailed by every kind of obloquy and intrigue. The climax has been reached in the formation of the admirably named Confederacy Club, which exists to remove by political assassination all those Unionist candidates and members who will not accept the latest Tariff Reform shibboleth. The club consists, I understand, of some of the younger and more hot-headed Tariff Reformers, stiffened by a few embittered politicians who are anxious to pay off upon their colleagues and associates in the House the grudges they owe to fortune and the leaders of the party. The guiding spirit is that distinguished publicist who, when he is not fomenting war with Germany or intriguing against Mr. Balfour, finds the extermination of a few Unionist Free Traders a congenial relaxation. In their methods they have closely imitated some of the best known models of Irish sedition. Indeed, the relations between the Tariff Reform League and the Confederates so closely resemble those which existed between the Land League and the Invincibles, that the only remaining question is whether Mr. Austen Chamberlain or Mr. Bonar Law takes the part of No. 1. To these political

desperadoes a Radical or Socialist is preferable to a Unionist Free Trader, and by the time they have completely "purged" the party it will have about as much intellect and influence as the benches on which it sits.

It is one of the graver disadvantages of the process of purging that a test has become necessary whereby the true Tariff Reformer may be recognised and spared. Here a difficulty has arisen. The test to serve its purpose must be official. The whole object has been to substitute Tariff Reform for Unionism as the official policy of the party. Herculean efforts, therefore, have been made to induce the Leader of the party to devise such a test. It has not, indeed, been put to him precisely in that form, for the idea of purging and proscription is believed to be repugnant to his nature; but he has been encouraged to think that the great mass of the party are really agreed, and that he has merely to invent a formula to which all may conscientiously assent, and harmony will be restored. The truth, of course, is that the party on this question is split, not by one, but by half a dozen fissures in opinion, and the result has been that each formula in turn has been welcomed as decisive, and then discarded as ambiguous. The Birmingham speech will serve as an example. A tariff devised for revenue purposes which shall yet be useful for retaliation, for preference, and for the prevention of unfair competition, is proposed. It is further to be provided that raw materials are to be exempt, that no additional burden is to be put on the working classes, and that the duties are to be so small as not to affect the natural course of production or consumption. To so guarded a proposal it is urged that no Free Trader need object, while if it possesses all the fiscal qualities which are claimed for it, Tariff Reformers have little more to ask. When, however, the proposals are more closely examined, it is found that many of the points on which the fiscal controversy has raged are necessarily left unsettled. Is there to be a tax on corn or meat? What is meant by "raw materials" and "unfair competition"? How is the revenue to be substantially increased if no additional burden is to be put upon the working class? How can preference be given or unfair competition prevented if the natural course of production and consumption are to be left unaltered? Unfortunately it is precisely these and other like questions that have caused the differences within the Party, and until we are agreed on the answers to them we must continue to differ. It is, therefore, much to be feared that as a basis of party agreement the Birmingham formula will share the fate of its predecessors. In the meantime it has been a godsend to the Tariff Reformers. Their treatment of all their leader's utterances is consistent if peculiar. So much of

what he has said or written as supports their cause they seize upon with avidity. The limitations and conditions they either ignore or explain in a non-natural sense. The formula thus remodelled they proclaim as the true test of party loyalty, and all who will not accept it with its Tariff Reform glosses are exposed to the now familiar process of open attack and subterranean intrigue organised from Victoria Street.

I believe that in the City of London it sometimes happens that an upright if obstinate financier sets himself to oppose the not too scrupulous plans of a syndicate far more powerful than himself. If after due warning he persists in this quixotic course, he finds that all his ventures go a-wry; and unless his position is very firmly established, bankruptcy soon stares him in the face. The process is, I believe, called "freezing him out"; and those who have incurred the hostility of the Tariff Reform League will recognise the aptness of the expression. The treatment is disagreeable for the victim; but that, after all, is relatively a small matter. The serious consideration is the effect that these tactics of the Stock Exchange have upon the Unionist Party and upon the causes for which it stands. Unpopular as I believe Tariff Reform to be, I am convinced that the methods by which it has been advocated have weighted it with an unpopularity far heavier than belongs to the policy itself. The system of proscription and intrigue is repulsive enough. Even less defensible is the treatment of Mr. Balfour's speeches and writings. The attempt to pervert them into full-blooded Tariff Reform formulæ has only intensified the atmosphere of dishonesty already created by the exaggerated Imperialism of some of the more wealthy supporters of tariff change. Can it be wondered that a policy thus recommended fails to win the support of the more intelligent electors? Is it too late to urge Tariff Reformers, even in their own interest, to abandon the attempt to carry their policy by a *coup de main*? In any case it is earnestly to be hoped that the moderate men of all sections of opinion within the party will at last interfere and force a truce upon the Fiscal extremists. Our electoral disasters are not due to the dislike of the electors for the principles of Unionism or Conservatism. The recent Municipal Elections are conclusive on this point. That they do dislike Tariff Reform is, in my opinion, true; but I believe they dislike far more the atmosphere with which it is surrounded and the methods by which it has been advocated. Let these be once for all abandoned and there may yet be a possibility of the return of the Unionist party to something like its old position in the councils of the nation.

UNIONIST.

THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

THE courtesy of the Editor of this REVIEW offers me an opportunity of saying a few words, if I have them to say, in aid of some peaceful solution of the education question. In one sense, and in one only, is it easy to comply. The present controversy is so hateful, it is so prejudicial to a real concentration of thought and care upon pressing educational problems, it embitters so much the relations between Churchmen and Nonconformists which otherwise show so many tokens of increasing mutual intelligence and respect, that any true lover of religion, country and education must long for its peaceful solution. It were churlish to put aside any least opportunity of helping on a better day.

But beyond this nothing is easy. I have never believed, what I have often heard said, that a few representative men round a table could with goodwill draw up the heads of a settlement in a couple of hours. The matter is not, to my thinking, in so plastic a condition. Differences have hardened. Opinions have crystallised into programmes and watchwords. My "friends the enemy" seem to me to have encumbered themselves with formulas and indispensable conditions which leave them little freedom. There is little doubt that they would say the same of me.

There are, besides, many reasons against anything at all like the suggestion of a scheme. The ground is littered with such schemes. To add another would be futile. An individual, at least if he hold any responsible office, has no right to do anything of the kind without more authority than his own. In time of war—and we seem to live in one educationally—to take up a position is to invite assault. Concessions are treated as surrenders and become points of vantage for further attack.

There may, however, be some use in stating briefly, but with some regard to proportionate importance, the main points of principle and claim, as they appear to the great majority of attached and active Churchmen. This may be due to fair-minded opponents; and it may submit some material to the judgment of the more independent and

impartial sections of the public. But it is perhaps one of the special difficulties of the matter that men belonging to these sections, who ought to count for much in the solution of controversial questions, are disposed alternately to profess that the subject is too technical for their understanding or interest, and to speak as if it was one for their own summary decision. The ordinary Englishman wishes to be fair, and is in theory a lover of liberty. But he sometimes allows these good dispositions to be neutralised by a belief that what commends itself to him should be good enough for everybody, and by a disinclination for the mental effort needed to realise the meaning of differing views.

(1) My starting point is the assertion that our main desire is not denominational advantage but religious education. No doubt motives are mixed and issues are entangled. But speaking broadly, I am sure that this is at least as true as any like claim made by any large body of men in a matter of the kind. This has its bearing on more than one particular issue. Thus, in regard to the schools in "single-school areas" where Nonconformist minorities obviously were at some disadvantage, I myself indulged the hope that if the schools were carried on under conditions which ensured publicity and fairness (as the present arrangement does), Nonconformists would have acquiesced from the feeling that there was no other way of securing an equally religious school in teaching and tone; and that this counted for much more than a little more or less of denominational gain or loss. So again the same premise accounts for the impatience felt at the opposition of Churchmen to general undenominationalism, and explains the secession of some from our ranks. We are thought to be going counter to our own chief purpose. On this I have more to say in another connection.

(2) Our second principle is that religious education can only be given by convinced people teaching the belief which they gain from, and share with, some body of believers. This is patently open to many qualifications and exceptions. We only maintain its general truth, and it is with general systems that the discussion has to do. This would probably be accepted in most countries, whether they be such as Scotland, or (in another way) Holland, where the religious bodies cover the ground so that the public system is wholly or mainly founded upon them, or such as most of the Australian colonies where the bodies are left outside of that system and religion with them. But in England certain happy residues of agreement across denominational divisions among a large proportion of the people give plausibility to the idea of some common system in which all may acquiesce. Objections to its obvious illogicality and want of clear principle are met by the appeal to experience in Board Schools, and to the testimony given by ourselves to much that those schools have done.

It seems to me that the power of accord within certain limits, and for certain special purposes of teaching, between differing Christians is a valuable national asset. I think that there should be place for it, and that there are many places where it would offer a useful solution of difficult problems. But if so, it should be by some co-operation of those who represent the differing bodies. Something like this was suggested by an important gathering of Nonconformists and Churchmen in Lancashire in an utterance which was known as "The Manchester concordat" some two or three years ago. The late Dr. Moberly in the powerful essay which laid bare all the essential sophistry of undenominationalism still found room for something of this kind.

But it is necessary to point out distinctly that the thing which we have to deal with under the name of undenominationalism is something very different from this. It is an encroaching and grasping thing. It aims at being universal and (if it could) perhaps even exclusive. (Witness the bearing on *future* effort of the new Training College Regulations.) It would take the purse and power of the State, or of any local authorities, and put all others into the position of weak, poverty-stricken and out-distanced competitors. It would treat public committees indiscriminately elected from the mass of the citizens as adequate authorities to prescribe the forms of Christian teaching. It would commit that teaching to the hands of any citizen who "comes along" as a certificated teacher.

This is the force which it is impossible for us to treat otherwise than as an enemy. Churchmen who are most drawn to it have to prescribe conditions, to which it will not submit. They would ask (as some did the other day in a private memorandum) for securities that the teaching should be genuinely of the fundamental truths of Christianity, and that there should be conference with representatives of religion in fixing the subjects taught and in settling the conditions under which teachers are to be allowed to give it. There is only the smallest percentage of those who are Churchmen in anything more than name who would accept an undenominational plan without such conditions. But to no such conditions will militant undenominationalism readily submit. Religious Nonconformists, when pressed, acknowledge not only its inadequacy but the injury which it may do to a true conception of religion. They fall back upon another view of it as a moral teaching of civic value, with a religious spirit, and largely drawn from Christian sources.

Contrast the description of it recently given with authority by the "National Education Association." Speaking of the Cowper-Temple Clause they say, "It allows an almost unlimited range from absolutely 'secular to something far beyond elementary theology.'"

I do not forget that I am writing for peace and not polemically,

and I am certain that I serve that purpose by asking men of all opinions to consider whether it is possible that men of deep conviction about religion should acquiesce in the bestowal of a huge preference, if not a monopoly, upon such a thing as the last quotation describes. It would be the creation and endowment of a Frankenstein dressed in the honoured livery of national authority, about whose performance and influence direct and indirect the boldest can hardly venture to prophesy.* Yet for the moment this is in substance the aim of the powers which hold the field. This is what the Secondary Schools and Training College Regulations (no doubt valuable in many respects) have made convincingly clear. It is no longer a question of "milk for babes who cannot understand our dogmas." These plausibilities of the Primary School controversy have no bearing on a case where the question is that of giving to teacher-recruits the fullest teaching, training and equipment for their future work. Nor is it a question of "admitting a few Nonconformists, at more risk to "them than loss to us," into the religious system of our College. That is a minor matter compared with the rules for the future, which are *prohibitive of any* but undenominational Colleges, Hostels or Secondary Schools.

I think that the objections to such a "solution" of the religious question are weighty. But it is important, in appealing to impartial judges or even to general opinion, to lay the main stress upon the fact that, right or wrong, these objections are entertained, upon grounds of deep principle, by large bodies of citizens, differing otherwise from each other, and certainly not of the kind who least deserve consideration in the matter.

(3) This brings me to our third principle, viz., that the national system should be built on the most inclusive basis. Not merely to satisfy objectors, but in order to give the most hospitable welcome to those who are able and willing to help with the best that is in them in the difficult work of education, is such inclusiveness to be desired. It will secure the maximum of energy, and incidentally it will secure a variety which to many of the best judges is an end in itself in educational matters. This applies alike to the teachers themselves and to those whose interest in the schools links the school-work to the general life of the community.

The continuance of denominational schools, and the part allowed to denominational management are subordinate, though most important and intensely difficult parts, of this larger matter. I will only remark upon them that no one can profitably judge until he has carefully surveyed the various districts of the country and taken stock

* As I write there comes from America notice that the New York Education Authority have, out of deference to the Jews, ordered a revision of all books of hymn and prayer, in order to leave out anything distinctively Christian. The word Christ is, we are told, to be "eliminated." This is quite logical, but none the less deplorable; and it is intensely instructive.

of their baffling differences. He must consider the cases where, as in parts of Wales and elsewhere, a denominational school means privilege to a minority; the districts where denominational schools are almost survivals among a number of provided schools all round them, but are still maintained at great labour and expense by those who have little of these to spare, for the sake of the better religious opportunities which they give; the varying position of country schools, sometimes schools of advantage to a majority, often entirely satisfying the whole population; and again the districts, like Lancashire, where such schools are strongly entrenched as the main supply of large areas urban, semi-urban and rural. I have little opinion of the man, to whatever side he belongs, who thinks that this is a problem to be lightly solved. But I cannot doubt that in any wise and liberal system there ought to be a permanent place for no inconsiderable number of denominational schools. And here, again, I believe that the number of Churchmen who will not agree so far as this is extremely small.

But important as this is I put it in the second rank; the best claim of the denominational school is that it represents most adequately one form of conscience, and ultimately its justification must be found in parental preference and desire. It is this which supplies, as I believe, the leading principle of a true solution. I should not assert that in a matter so complex it can claim unlimited rights; it must submit to qualification and take its place with other principles, theoretical and practical. But it ought to lead, and any large and liberal application of it would, I believe, be widely welcomed, and go farther than anything else could do to bring us near to a solution. I cannot disguise that in my own opinion it should take precedence of teachers' rights, hearty though I should wish the recognition of these latter to be. As a matter of fact I believe that the two would largely coincide. Certainly a system which ignores the rights of parents will deny to quantities of teachers the opportunity of giving their work in the way that would be most congenial and unconstrained. I cannot speak with confidence about the relation of parental rights to the conscience of ratepayers, since I have never myself felt the difficulty of paying rates to common funds out of which Roman Catholics and Jews, ratepayers like myself, receive support for their schools in proportion to their numbers. I own that I do not regard a fair system as compatible with an unqualified acceptance of the 'passive resisters' claim. But I should be very sanguine that at least over large parts of the area that claim is quite compatible with that of parents' rights; and the "passive resister," like the rest of us, has to learn that he cannot get all that he asks, unless by a tyranny of onesidedness.

No doubt it is easy to dwell on parental indifference, and on the danger of the parent being 'exploited.' But surely this is to magnify

smaller things, and slur over larger ones. None of us admires parental indifference, and if parents are stirred up to more active interest, and made to feel their responsibility, the result for good must largely outweigh the harm of a little denominational over-zeal.

I would therefore submit that to satisfy my third principle of inclusiveness, the main condition is that we give first place to the rights of parents.

I am fully aware that these remarks are very general, very inadequate, and in part very trite. But I have done my best in a difficult position, not of my own making, but of the Editor's. I have not consciously written what should offend. I have tried to show what the substance of our position is, and—as I hope—that it is not narrow or contemptible. I have not dwelt on the recent exertions of Churchmen, and their results, though as I know them, made in South London by overworked clergy and poor parishes, they might almost win sympathy even from Dr. Clifford. I sometimes feel that that vigorous advocate must smile at our impotence when he thinks what he would have made of any attempt to set aside or override a Nonconformist claim that should carry credentials approaching those which the Church can show in service, effort and self-denial upon the field of education.

I believe that any proposals which show a real desire to take these into account and do them justice will receive from many of us grave and thoughtful consideration, even though they ask of us, as of others, our share of concession and sacrifice. I am sure that any attempt simply to override them would be resisted to the last, and even if it gained temporary victory, would not bring the peace which all true men must desire.

E. SOUTHWARK.

THE COMING EDUCATION BILL.

I N acceding to the Editor's request for a short article on this much-discussed subject, let it be understood that I am not asked to draft an Education Bill, but to give my personal opinions as a Free Church citizen chiefly upon those phases of the question around which the keenest controversy still centres. In 1902 Mr. Balfour's Government used its majority to pass an Act entirely in the interests of the hierarchy and at its bidding. In this procedure he followed in the steps of previous Conservative Governments, who, departing from the principles of "Forster's Act" (which they nevertheless now freely commend) by "Fee Grant" and "Aid Grant," prepared the way for placing the whole maintenance of sectarian schools upon public funds, a burden which Mr. Balfour completed by the "Rate Aid" of the 1902 Act. I remind my readers of these facts because, whilst the Act of 1870 was never accepted *con amore* by Liberals and Free Churchmen as a body, it was assented to as a compromise by a majority, whereas the Acts to which I have referred were strenuously opposed by both, as being unjust to the community and unduly favouring the Denominational Schools. Since these occurrences political power has passed into other hands: consequently any Minister who deals with Education has first to recover the position of 1870 before he can in any degree mark the progress of public opinion since that date, or respond to the principle so strongly asserted at the General Election, viz., that public funds should no longer be used for sectarian purposes or without adequate public control. One attempt to legislate on these lines has failed, partly through the character of the Bill itself, but mainly through the action of the House of Lords. Still, the question is very much alive, and in again attempting to deal with it the Government has three courses open.

1.—To frame a Bill based on compromise, conceding to the Denominational Party what its extreme advocates demand as a settlement. Such a Bill would discredit the Government and be rejected by the House of Commons.

2.—The Bill of last session can be reintroduced practically in the form originally presented to the House. This, in my judgment, would not again be assented to by the bulk of the Liberal Party, and would not satisfy the nation.

3.—The Minister of Education can produce an entirely new measure—more simple in construction and framed to meet the needs of the nation as a whole, regardless of the contending claims of sects or parties. Such a Bill the country has a right to expect, and I have the confidence to believe it will not be disappointed.

The fundamental principles of a just National scheme are, after all, few and well understood, and it would be comparatively easy to draft such a scheme if the ground were clear; but, alas, it has not been clear for the past 100 years, and from this fact have arisen the inefficiency, the deplorable delays, and the lamentable strife associated with the question. Surely it is manifest by this time that the claims which many Denominationalists have made in the past, and continue to make, are wholly incompatible with the Educational needs of the nation, and any Bill framed to satisfy them is foredoomed to failure.

Let me enumerate under four heads the principles which must form the basis of any satisfactory Bill.

1.—All Elementary schools receiving public money must be State schools: such schools must be free, and sufficient accommodation must be provided within a reasonable distance of every child of school age.

2.—Every State school must be under elective local control of a representative character, and, by preference, elected by direct vote.

3.—All teachers in these schools, being employed by the State, are civil servants, and must therefore be free from any Denominational tests as also must be the managers.

4.—No Secondary School, Training College, Hostel, or institution of a sectarian character should be subsidised from public funds.

Whilst earnestly desiring to see a fair and reasonable settlement of this vexed question, I feel that any compromise of these principles would be "a half-step toward evil and therefore wholly wrong." They are demanded alike in the interests of Educational efficiency and civil and religious freedom. From them there should be no serious departure, and no attempts should be made in the Bill to meet demands which are incompatible with them. So far, I have covered ground which is accepted by a large majority of Educationalists, but I now propose to go a little more into detail upon more debatable matter.

Believing that simple Bible teaching is desired by a large majority of the nation, the Government would be very unwise to prohibit it, and therefore they may well leave the question in the hands of the Local Authority (as at present) to determine its nature and extent,

limited by the proviso that no dogmatic teaching shall be given in school hours, or by State appointed teachers, and that whatever teaching is given shall be under a conscience clause, and that no parent need send his child for such teaching, and no teacher shall be compelled to give it. Some broad-minded Churchmen, whose opinions are entitled to every consideration, require the claims of Denominationalists to be met by facilities for their special teaching being given in the school buildings, during school hours, by voluntary teachers; but I submit that such an arrangement would destroy the discipline of the school, break up its ordinary curriculum and classification, and divide the children into sects at an age when they understand nothing about the questions which produce the division. Moreover, if it is asked for in *all* schools, such a demand would be strongly resisted by the defenders of Council schools, which have not hitherto permitted the priest or minister to teach religion in them, and if only into what are now known as non-provided schools, it would invalidate the principle of one type of schools only. May I suggest still further that such a concession would not appease the opposition of the Ritualists or Roman Catholics who conscientiously claim to set up barriers of their own. They must have the right "atmosphere" through all the teaching, and dogma is to them the most essential part of Education; therefore I despair of making any settlement on National lines to which they will agree. If absolutely frank in their opposition they would take their stand against any Bill at all. They contend that the State has neither the right nor the ability to teach dogma, that such teaching can only be properly given through the Church, and as they believe it to be the most important part of the daily instruction, it logically follows that they must claim the entire control of the schools. Such a position wrecks any National system, and therefore the Government must choose between the Church (or, rather, that portion of it with which I have dealt) and the nation.

It has been suggested that these claims might be consistently met and satisfied by what is known as "contracting out." Briefly, the answer to this is that even if with safeguards the Government could secure Educational efficiency (which is very doubtful), the curse of the dual system would be confirmed, and the grant of public funds to sectarian schools perpetuated, with, probably, under favourable conditions, a revival of the cry of the "intolerable strain"; and therefore the Government will be wise not to acknowledge a system which must traverse the principles of the Bill, though it is only fair to say the funds would be Imperial, administered under the control of the Board of Education, and would be ostensibly used for secular purposes only.

The agitation fomented by the National Society, claiming for the parents the right to have their children taught their own faith at the expense of the community, is another attempt to get rid of the

Cowper Temple limitation, and has no basis either of justice or constitutional right. Moreover, its advocates may be reminded that if genuine it would practically banish the Catechism and "definite Church teaching" from many Anglican schools in single school areas where a majority of the children are Nonconformist. Even Mr. Balfour had to admit that these so-called rights of parents cannot prevail against the declared will of the country, and when an amendment affirming this right was moved by Lord Hugh Cecil in the Parliament of 1902 he, with a large majority of his followers, voted against it; therefore the present Government need not be alarmed as to the effect of such an agitation. What then can be done to meet those who uphold the existing conditions without impairing the general principles I have laid down? First as to buildings. The universal provision of State schools necessitates some plan for dealing with a large number of existing buildings. I cannot agree that there is any *obligation* to take over these schools at all, and certainly not at their capital value. The portion of the subscribers' money originally spent on them has received its *quid pro quo* by 30 years of service to the Denomination, but such buildings as are suitable and up-to-date might be taken over, where the trusts are Educational, at a small rent, and where they are Denominational, or the buildings inferior, then other provision must be made by the Local Authority, aided by liberal building grants. It is also worth noting that a great majority of the trust deeds of these schools would be carried out under the new conditions more in harmony with the desires of their Protestant founders than they are under existing sacerdotal management.

Finally, as to religious teaching. In matters of conscience minorities have a right to consideration, but the nature and claims of these minorities must also be considered before their right to override the will of the nation can be admitted. No wrong can be done to the Protestant conscience, either Anglican or Nonconformist, by simple Bible teaching. That there is a general agreement as to the common elements of Christianity suitable for teaching to children few will venture to deny. In connection with what is known as the "Adult School Movement" nearly two hundred thousand hard-headed working men meet every Sunday morning for Bible study, men of all Denominations and of none, including many Anglicans and some Roman Catholics, and after 22 years' active personal connection with this movement I can testify that I have never known the "religious difficulty" arise in any form; surely, therefore, there need be no such problem with the children. The case of the Agnostic can be effectively met by the conscience clause, and where the Jews and the Romanists have but few adherents they must be dealt with in the same way, as, indeed, they are at present. The multiplication of small schools under existing

conditions is a very heavy burden on the ratepayer, and most unprofitable from an educational point of view, and ought to be checked, but in districts where these Churches are powerful the Local Authority would have the right to omit the Bible teaching in certain specified schools wholly attended by children of parents attached to these bodies, and also to secure facilities where desired for giving their special religious teaching out of school hours, and at their own cost. Any demand beyond this comes into collision with one or other of the principles which have been claimed as fundamental, and such demand has not been admitted either in America or our Colonies, where the same religious Denominations exist as here. I have still a section to deal with, which includes a number of Free Churchmen who stand for what is termed "purely secular instruction." This term is defined in a variety of ways—if it means to exclude the Bible altogether from the Schools they must first convert the nation to this view before they can call upon the Government to take such a serious step. "It is the only logical standpoint" they say. I reply by repeating some words I used elsewhere some time ago—"It may be so, though this is an open question, but even if it is how much of the Constitution under which we live would bear this logical test? And after all have they found a safe place on which to stand? Logic would compel the Agnostic to demand the exclusion from the list of our reading-books of much of the very best of the school literature in use every day in the schools, because it recognises a Higher power and a revealed religion, whilst it would also induce the Romanist to demand a history of England, and of some Continental countries, entirely different from those at present in use, on the plea that they do a grave injustice to the past records and work of his Church." In such issues as these common sense and fair play are the ruling sentiments, and these are best secured by the public control of an elected Local Authority.

On the lines here sketched we have a plan which clears the Educational field of everything belonging to private and denominational interests, schools everywhere under the direct control of the people and suitable to all the children, the buildings in the hands of the Local Authority, dogmatic religious teaching abolished, and tests for teachers gone except so far as character and ability are concerned; and thus the State holds itself absolutely neutral upon all the questions which affect Denominations, and this I submit is its proper position, and on this basis alone can sound legislation be founded, the great body of the people satisfied; and in this way the murmurs of the priest will be gradually extinguished as he realises that the time has arrived for securing justice and equality by keeping the sects altogether outside our public schools.

GEORGE WHITE.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS AND THE "BELONGING- LESS" POOR. A WORKHOUSE CENSUS.

"I 'VE no belongings at all. I shouldn't be here if I had." This is the sort of answer I often receive if, while going about in workhouses, I venture to ask the old folk whom I come across any question as to their relatives. "I've neither kith nor kin," an inmate will remark quite casually, as if being alone in the world was the most natural thing in life.

I used to wonder, sometimes, whether there really could be such a dearth of relations as there seems to be among these men and women whom the rate-payers support; and at length, to put the matter to the test, I set to work to take a kind of "belongings" census in a number of typical unions. It was only with such of the inmates as were aged that I concerned myself, however, only with such of them, in fact, as would have old-age pensions, were there a law in force securing an old-age pension to everyone above sixty-five. For these are the persons to whom belongings are of special importance now that there is a prospect of such a law actually coming into force. Old-age pensioners must have relations, relations too with whom they can live, if their pensions are to be of any real use to them. For in the working classes men and women alike are as a rule too infirm to live alone after sixty-five; and even if they are not, living alone on 5s. a week spells semi-starvation.

I took my first census in the workhouse at Southwark, the poorest and most depressing of all districts, surely. There I spent many long days sifting and sorting the inmates, trying to get into touch with them, trying to learn all the whys and wherefores of their being in this place to which no one resorts willingly. I plied them with questions; for if my enquiry were to serve any useful purpose, I must find out not only exactly what each one of them had in the way of relatives, but also what sort of relatives they were. I must find out, in fact, whether they were or were not of the sort who, in return for a meagre 5s. a week, would be likely to welcome as housemates folk heavily burdened with years, with tempers too, perhaps, and other infirmities.

When the inmates of the Southwark House had told me what they had to tell, and the officials there had put dots on their i's for them and verified their statements, I betook myself to other unions, to some in rural districts, to some in provincial towns, and to one in a busy London suburb. Last of all, I went to the workhouse at Kensington. I should have liked to go also to the workhouses at West Ham and Richmond in Surrey; but when I asked the Boards of Guardians there to allow me, they both stoutly refused, not deeming it advisable perhaps to admit into their domains one who was avowedly bent on asking questions. In the course of my search, I visited the most diverse unions, well-to-do unions, poverty-stricken unions, unions where out-relief is granted freely, and unions where there is much weighing of pros and cons before it is granted at all. And wherever I went I made it my business to try to ascertain, in a somewhat rough and ready fashion, it is true, sometimes, how many of the old people who were receiving indoor relief there had relations with whom they could live, if they each had a pension of 5s. a week, and how many of them were quite alone in the world.

In the Kensington workhouse I found 685 inmates above sixty-five. 157 of them, however, I left unquestioned; for whether they had relations or not was practically of no importance, as even if they had, they could not live with them. They were all very infirm, so infirm that an institution was the only place for them, as they must have within hail a trained nurse, if not a doctor. Of the remaining 528 it was only the minority who were even fairly strong: evidently, in the class that drift into workhouses, both men and women are more often than not near the end of their strength already by sixty-five, although some few of them are extraordinarily vigorous at ninety. Most of these people were afflicted in one way or another; some were deaf, others blind, some "weak i' th' head," others "weak in th' arm," while many were more or less crippled with rheumatism. I doubt whether one in twenty of them could earn a shilling a week if turned out of the workhouse to-morrow; or whether one in ten could fend for themselves and keep a room decently clean. Still, although so far as the mass of them were concerned, there could be—or at any rate there ought to be—no question of their ever living alone, there is no reason, as they were not so infirm as to require special nursing, why they should not live with their relatives, if relatives they had able and willing to take charge of them.

Of the 528 inmates above sixty-five who were strong enough to leave the workhouse, 276 were women; and of these no fewer than 104 had not a single relation in the world, so far as they knew, not even a distant cousin. Some of them, indeed, according to their own account, never had had a relation; not even a mother. They

had never heard of, much less seen, any living creature with whom they could claim kinship. Others, and they of course the great majority, had had uncles and aunts and cousins once upon a time, as well as parents and children; but they had "buried them all," as they told me. "I've had thirteen children and I've not a soul left," one poor old creature complained bitterly. "The Almighty has taken them every one, and I'm here a lone woman."

Then besides the 104 who had no relations at all, there were 48 more who were just as badly off as if they had none, as those they had were either in institutions—workhouses, asylums, etc.—or were "lost." The lost relation always figures largely in the tales the poor tell. Although 172 of these old women assured me positively that they had relations, somewhere—they knew they had—a good fourth of them had evidently no idea where. Many of them boasted of sons or daughters in "Foreign parts"; but whether in America, Australia, Africa, or perhaps Glasgow, they were by no means always sure—they had not heard of them, in some cases for years. An old dame who had not had a letter for forty years from what she called her sole surviving relative, once informed me gravely that she was expecting one every day.

Although 172 of these women maintained that they had relations, only 103 claimed to have sons or daughters, at least one son or one daughter each; and of these who did, 66 admitted frankly, the very first time they were asked, that their sons or daughters were of the worthless order, so far as home-providing went. "They could not take me in, you see, they have nowhere to put me," one after another even of those who had both sons and daughters informed me mournfully; while a few of them added, only a few, and "they would not if they could." Even the best of daughters cannot take her mother in, it must be remembered, if she has nowhere to house her, and rents are terribly high in London. Besides, there is generally a son-in-law to be reckoned with. Many a man who would make a home for his own mother gladly, bars his door inexorably against his wife's; just as many a woman who would welcome her own mother with delight, stoutly refuses to allow her husband's to cross her threshold. Of the 103 old ladies who had children, only 37 were quite sure, when I enquired, that were they to become pensioners with 5s. a week each, their children would provide them each with a home. A few more, it is true, hoped that theirs would do likewise, although they seemed to have doubts on the subject. And their doubts proved to be well founded; for when they asked their kinsfolk if they really would take them in, the answer was in every case a decided negative. What was still sadder, 15 of the old women who had been quite sure theirs would be only too glad to have them, could they have with them 5s. a week each, found that they were wrong. They, too, received

"no" as an answer when they asked the all-important question. Only 20 out of the 103 could induce their children even to say they would take them in, should they ever have pensions; and certainly not more than eight would actually be taken in, were the matter put to the test. Of this proof was soon obtained, for in no fewer than twelve cases the children straightway began to make excuses and declare that the thing was impossible, when I went to see them and made them realise that they might actually be called upon to provide their father or mother with a home; while in two cases more they "decamped." Thus, had an old-age pension law come into force the day I completed my census, out of the 353 old women in the Kensington workhouse only eight, at the very most, would have been able to say good-bye to the place and go to their own people. All the rest were either too infirm to leave, or had no people to whom they could go.

So far as quantity is concerned, old men seem to be better off in the way of belongings than old women. In this union only 67 of the 252 men above sixty-five, who were not very infirm, had no relations at all, although 46 more had practically no relations. One hundred and eighteen of them had at least one son or one daughter; but unfortunately, as they soon let me know, their sons and daughters also were for the most part of the worthless order. "It ain't no use at all reckoning on one's children nowadays," a poor old fellow remarked bitterly, and he was evidently right; for 94 of the men who had children told me plainly that they knew no one who would provide them with a refuge, even if paid for so doing 5s. a week. Only 24 out of the 252 whom I questioned claimed to have sons or daughters to whom they could go, sure of a welcome, if they each had a pension; and eight out of the 24 confessed later that in this they had made a mistake; while four more might truthfully have made the same confession. They had found on enquiring that neither sons nor daughters were willing even to promise to take them in. Only 12 old men were really convinced that they actually had homes they could go to, if they had pensions; and 11 of them were counting without their host, I found, when I appealed to the owners of the homes. In this huge workhouse there were, in fact, only one old man and eight old women who had relatives willing to promise to take charge of them should an old-age pension law be passed. And it was only a case of promising, it must be remembered; and between promising and doing there is many a slip, as my experience at Southwark proves.

In the Southwark workhouse, when I took my census, there were 725 inmates above sixty-five; and the Guardians were kind enough to offer to grant 5s. a week out-relief at once, without waiting for the passing of any pension law, to every old woman I could find

among them who had a suitable home to go to, and wished to go to it. They did not even stipulate that the old woman should possess all the virtues, or that her character should be as that of *Cæsar's* ideal wife. I questioned only 198 of the women and 100 of the men, as the rest were all too infirm to leave the workhouse. Of the women 62 had actually no relations, and 34 more had practically no relations. Forty began by assuring me that they had good homes to go to, if they could have with them 5s. a week; but 25 of them admitted later that their relations, when asked to take them in, had refused. Fifteen of the old women really induced their relations to promise to provide them each with a home; but when the time came for providing it, the old excuse-making began; and the end of it was that only three out of the 198 were able to leave the workhouse.

Of the 100 men at Southwark, 24 had no relations, and only ten even claimed to have relations with whom they could live.

In the suburban union also the Guardians kindly offered to grant out-relief at the rate of 5s. a week to any old men or old women I might come across who had suitable homes to go to. They, however, insisted that the old men or women must be respectable. There were 189 inmates above sixty-five at the time. One hundred and eleven of them, however, were too infirm to live anywhere but in an institution. Of the remaining 78, 18 had no relations at all, and 10 more had practically no relations. Fifty had each at least one son or one daughter; but only nine—six men and three women—claimed to have a son or a daughter who would provide them with a home. There was one old man more, it is true, who assured me that, although none of his children would take him in, he had a "gentleman friend" who would be only too delighted to do so, if the Guardians would give him 5s. a week; but unfortunately, he was of the sort that could not be trusted to spend even 5s. discreetly.

Of the six men who professed to have faith in the willingness of their children to receive them, one was an ex-habitual drunkard, another an ex-habitual criminal, the third was a wastrel whose sons and daughters had already refused to take him in at any price, and the wife and son of the fourth were paying 4s. a week for him to be in the workhouse, as live with him they could not, because drunk he would. There were only two to whom the epithet "respectable" could be applied with any show of reason, and one of them was in the workhouse only temporarily, just recovering from an illness. Thus there was only one man whom I could suggest as being possibly a suitable case for a 5s. a week allowance. And there was only one woman; for although all the three women who claimed to have some relation with whom they could live were respectable, the relation of one of them was an only son who was out of work; and, of another, an only

son whose address was lost. Among the whole 187 I could find only two, one man and one woman, who might possibly go to live with their own people, were they provided with 5s. a week each. And even with them it was a case of "might possibly," as their relations might begin to make excuse when asked to take them in.

In the large provincial workhouses, those in industrial centres, the old people, so far as I could judge, were neither richer nor poorer in belongings than the old people in the London houses. Nor were even those in the smaller provincial town houses much richer. In the Eastbourne workhouse there were, when I took my census, 37 men and 35 women above sixty-five, exclusive of the very infirm; and nine of the men and ten of the women were quite belongingless. In the Thirsk union, when I was there, there were only 16 inmates above sixty-five, and five of them were alone-standing. At Eastbourne only three of the inmates who had children seemed to think they could find a home with them, if they had pensions; and for my own part, I am inclined to doubt whether, if it came to the point, more than one of them would actually find a home; or whether one at all of the old men at Thirsk.

In the small country workhouses the state of things is quite different, oddly enough. There, again and again, I have come across both men and women the name of whose relations was Legion—in some of them all the inmates seem to be related to one another. For practical purposes, however, these relations are, as a rule, quite worthless. The old man who, when I asked him if he had any children, replied: "Eh, a gay few, though I wadna giv' ye a brass "farthing for one o' th' lot," had good reason for what he said; for not "one o' th' lot" could, or would take him in, and his was a typical case. Besides, although in rural workhouses the great majority of the inmates undoubtedly have belongings and to spare, even there the more respectable among them are almost always "lone folk." In London, as in all large towns where the cost of living is high and housing is hard to find, it is otherwise, of course; but in small towns it rarely happens, and in villages almost never, that really respectable old people go to the union, unless they are either alone in the world or sorely afflicted. I once sifted and sorted carefully the inmates of eight little rural workhouses, and I found among them both men and women who were thoroughly respectable, but all who were respectable, excepting one old woman—she was eighty-nine—were either practically without relations, or were suffering from some infirmity that required more careful nursing than could be had in a working-class home. The old woman had, it is true, many relations, grandchildren, so many, indeed, that as they all live in one cottage, there was no room there for her.

In the first rural workhouse I visited there were only two men and six women above sixty-five; and with one exception they were all in

some way afflicted—two of them with a craving for strong drink. As for the exception, he was seventy-seven and had not a relation in the world. In the second little workhouse there were four men and four women above sixty-five, three of the women being above eighty, and three of the men above seventy. One woman was an imbecile, one was hopelessly degraded; while two were worthy old dames and fairly strong, but one of them was belongingless, and the other was the woman with the many grandchildren. In the third house there were six old men; but only one of them had relations with whom he could live had he 5s. a week, and he was blind. There were also four old women, two of whom were afflicted; while the third was so objectionable no one would live with her; and the fourth had no relations excepting a son in "Foreign Parts." In each of these eight unions it was the same tale: such of the aged inmates as were respectable almost invariably either had no relations or were too infirm to live with them; while such as were not respectable—the wastrel, ex-criminal tribe—had no relations who would take them in on such profitless terms as 5s. a week.

In the workhouses I visited from first to last while on census-making bent, there were, roughly speaking, 2,200 inmates above sixty-five. Quite 1,000 of them, however, belonged to the very infirm class, the class that require trained nursing, and must therefore of necessity be in institutions of one sort or another. A good 400 more were so feeble in body or mind as to require more care than even a devoted daughter could probably bestow, if she had children to attend to, or work to do outside her own home. Among the whole 2,200 there were, so far as I could judge, only about 800, at most, who did not require more care, if they were to be properly cared for, than the chances are they would receive, were they to quit the workhouse and go to live in the cottages or tenements of their relations, even if they had relations.

What the 1,000 very infirm inmates had in the way of relations I do not know; for, as there could be no question of their even leaving the workhouse, to have worried them with enquiries would have smacked of cruelty. Probably they had more than their fair share, however, for among workhouse inmates belongings seem to vary in number inversely with the strength of those who possess them. As for the remaining 1,200, some 360 had actually no relations, and 208 more had practically no relations. 147 claimed to have relations with whom they could live, if they each had a pension; but 64 of them, after consulting their relations, withdrew their claims; and the claims of 60 more proved on investigation to be unfounded. Out of the 1,200 only 23, so far as I could ascertain, really had relations with whom they might, and probably would, be able to live, provided of course, they had pensions. The 400 inmates who were more or less feeble had not a single son or daughter among them able and

willing to make a home for any one of them, in return for 5s. a week. Such of their children as were able to do so were not willing; and such as were willing were not able—either they had nowhere where they could lodge them, or no time in which to tend them. Among all these 2,200 old men and women whom I came across in the course of my enquiry, I could find only 23—and I sought very diligently—of whom I could feel even fairly sure that, were they to have 5s. a week each, they would be able to leave the workhouse and live with their own people. Only 23 out of 2,200, practically one per cent. Little wonder being alone in the world seems to these poor old folk the most natural thing in life.

In all the workhouses in England and Wales, together with their antechambers, the casual wards, there are, according to the last census, 76,089 inmates above sixty-five. If, therefore, the houses I dealt with are fairly typical, and I think they are, only about 760 out of the whole 76,089 would be able to return to their own people, if a pension law were to come into force; only about 760 of them would, in fact, be one whit better off than they are now. Not but what ten times that number and more would quit the workhouses at once, were such a law actually to come into force. Again and again I was told, by one after another of these old people, that they would not remain there a single day if they had 5s. a week to depend on. There was something quite pitiable, indeed, in the eagerness with which some of them strove to convince me that I was wrong in thinking they could not live in comfort on that sum, even though they were lone folk, and perhaps in failing health. "Yes, rent does run away with a sight of money, and so does coal," an old woman, who was evidently on her last legs, admitted sorrowfully. "Still, one doesn't need much food, you see, when one's old," she added, "and I could manage quite nicely on 5s. a week."

It is a terrible trial, it must be remembered, to decent old men and women to live in the workhouse, penned up together with the vicious and degraded, going share and share alike with the criminal, never alone day in day out for a single moment. It is a trial, too, in its way, to be there, though a wholesome one, to the vicious, degraded and criminal, especially to such of them as have a craving for drink, a marked distaste for washing themselves, or a fancy for hearing the latest racecourse news. Thus, that there will be an exodus from workhouses as soon as old-age pensions are to be had, must be regarded as a foregone conclusion. The more worthy of the aged inmates who are physically able will certainly, for the most part, turn out, belongingless though they may be; and so, I am inclined to think, will the really worthless. And the result, so far as the former are concerned, will be great misery for themselves; and, so far as the latter, trouble, anxiety and expense for the community.

These ex-workhouse inmates would have to live alone, it must be remembered; for, as we have seen, they have no relatives with whom they could live; and out of 5s. a week they could not afford to pay anyone to live with them. They might, it is true, board themselves out, if only they could find caretakers willing to receive them as boarders; but of that there is no chance, as I know by experience. I have tried again and again to find suitable homes for old people whom I wished to save from the workhouse; but I have never yet succeeded. To board out children is not always easy, and to board out their grandfathers and grandmothers is impossible: even in country places, in this our day, no one cares to take in a strange old man or woman for 5s. a week. When I once asked the reason, the reply I received was emphatic: "It ain't the trouble I mind, though 'an old man's a lot o' trouble, what with his whims and his fancies 'and his tempers; it's just the washing." Thus these ex-inmates would certainly have to live alone; and they are all above sixty-five, at an age, therefore, when those among them who could live alone with decency and in comfort are few and far between.

I often wonder whether Poor Law Guardians have any idea how the belongingless aged poor to whom they grant out-relief really live. I once found an old woman who was blind as a bat, stone deaf, and completely paralysed, living quite alone on out-relief. A friend came in just now and then, she told me, to give her a shake up, and bring her a bit of food. I have known outdoor paupers who would go for the week together without ever washing themselves, and would let their rooms go for the month without ever a single "sweep-up." And this not through any love of dirt, but because they had not the strength to be cleanly. Only the other day I came across one who keeps her food supply in a drawer. There are old women on out-relief lists who are never free from burns, because they fall periodically into the fire; old women and old men, too, who risk the lives of their neighbours every night, by the way they play with their lamps. And as it is with these people, so would it be also, of course, with the belongingless old-age pensioners.

Then, not only would these poor old creatures have to live alone, but alone on 5s. a week; and with 2s. on an average, at the very least, going in rent. Thus 3s. a week, or about 5d. a day, is all they would have wherewith to defray the cost not only of food and clothing—shoes, too—but also of fires, lights, and a bit of soap from time to time. One would say that this was impossible, were it not that it is actually being done. A very worthy old lady, a neighbour of mine, is living exactly as these belongingless old-age pensioners would have to live; that is, she is living and paying her way on 5s. a week. I once found her, however, it must be confessed, on a Sunday evening with only a halfpenny in the house, and her dole was not due until the following Friday. Another time, she was left for nearly a week

without any money at all, having used what she had to pay an old debt; and when asked how she had managed, she replied, quite cheerily: "Lor, Sir, it was just a bit of luck, but the 'bilious' come 'that week.'" A woman who could count the 'bilious' as a bit of luck must have fought the grim wolf at very close quarters. From the material standpoint, at any rate, the second state of the old people who leave the workhouse to live alone on 5s. a week will certainly be infinitely worse than the first.

Besides, they will not leave it for long; sooner or later the day will come when they cannot possibly live alone, and when worthy and worthless alike will have to betake themselves back to their old much-hated quarters. And meanwhile this fact will be staring them straight in the face—let them turn where they will they will see it—destroying effectually any little grain of comfort they might otherwise have.

To those who have belongings with whom they can live,* old-age pensions will no doubt be a great boon; to those, too, who have savings of their own wherewith to eke out their 5s.; but to the belongingless poor who are penniless, the poor who are already in the workhouse or hovering around its door, they will assuredly be no boon at all. These people, even when they each have a pension, will still have to choose between going half-starved or passing their days in the union. And there are worthy old people among them; for to be belongingless is a misfortune that may befall a saint. As a rule, indeed, even in town workhouses, it is the belongingless inmates who are the most worthy. The majority of them are always women—women whose children are dead or lost, deserted wives, spinsters "just 'left behind'" by their relatives; for the average woman-worker cannot save, as she needs for bare daily bread every penny she can earn and more, if, as often happens, she has others to support as well as herself in the days of her strength. In the country there are women whose earnings are under 6s. a week, and even in London there are thousands whose earnings are under 10s. Many of the belongingless are of the unskilled class, and the average unskilled working man is not very much better off than the working woman, if he has a wife and children to maintain. For him as for her to save is impossible; he therefore, as she, must, let him do what he will, let him pinch and save as he may, drift sooner or later into the workhouse. Both he and she drift there now when their working days are past, unless, indeed, they die; and as it is with them now, so will it be also, inevitably, when they have old-age pensions, if they be belongingless. Thus for them the Pension Law will be practically a dead letter: it is their more fortunate, though perhaps less deserving, fellows with relations who will benefit by it.

Yet these men and women who, although they have toiled and moiled and led decent lives, have never had the chance of saving,

never had anything to save, are the very people whose lot ought to be bettered, and whose burden ought to be rendered less heavy. This is a point on which we are all agreed. They are the people, indeed, for whose sake the average tax-payer is prepared—so far as he is prepared—to provide the money for old-age pensions. Were it not that his conscience is troubled at the thought of decent old men and women being forced to go to the workhouse, when their strength fails them, he would assuredly regard old-age pension schemes with much less favour even than he does. But evidently decent old men and women will still have to go there, even when the best of these schemes has been adopted, unless, indeed, some other refuge be provided for them. Thus if the tax-payer is to obtain anything in the way of peace of mind in return for his money that will be spent on pensions, some other refuge will have to be provided, as in fairness it ought to be, surely. Great injustice will certainly be done to the very section of the poor whom we are all most anxious to help, if, when old-age pensions are granted, old-age homes are not provided for the pensioners who are alone in the world and respectable.

These homes would not need to be many, nor yet to be large; for among even the aged belongingless the undeserving, of course, far outnumber the deserving; and for the undeserving the workhouse is the most suitable place. So far as they are concerned the pity is, as we shall find to our cost when they have their pensions, that they cannot be forced to remain there, but are free to wander out at will. Then for the very infirm among the deserving belongingless, the hospital or infirmary would be the only place. For them all that could be done would be to reserve special wards for their use—in Copenhagen this is done. Thus it is only a little company for whom homes would have to be provided. And the providing of them would entail no great expense; for they must of course be simple homely places, as otherwise the inmates would not be comfortable—poor old people have no taste at all for electric-lighted palaces. As for the cost of living, that could hardly be higher in old-age homes than it is in latter-day workhouses; and it would certainly be considerably lower, if economy and common sense were shown in the way they were managed. "One doesn't need much food, you see, 'when one's old,'" as the woman said. What one does need, if one is a decent old body, and life is to be worth living, is a home to which no disgrace is attached, a home where the door is barred against the vicious, degraded and criminal, where one is kindly treated and left to go one's own way as far as possible. In such a home every inmate might be well housed, well fed, and well clothed, as well as kindly treated, and yet the cost per head be under 9s. a week. Of this the old-age refuges at Eastbourne and at Whyteleafe are a proof. In London workhouses the cost per head is 14s. a week, a fact to which attention cannot be drawn too often.

THE LOVE OF LIBERTY AND THE LOVE OF TRUTH.

THE issue between Vaticanism and Modernism has its counterpart in other Churches than that of Rome, and it is especially apt to be reflected in those that are most free and sensitive. It is all part of one spiritual movement in the general mind. The phenomena are collateral manifestations, or doublettes of the inevitable collision between not merely the traditional, but the evangelical on the one hand, and the critical on the other, within the Church's faith and life. It is a modern phase of the age-long Lord's controversy and its battles long ago. It is no freak of man's perverse wits and many inventions.

The popularising of critical results (or experiments) in connection with the Bible is forcing a grave situation for the Churches, whose chief concern must always be that of positive faith. The special difficulty lies here, not only that the popularising is largely in the hands of amateurs, and even pressmen, but that questions still pending, and questions not of religious experience, but which are among the most intricate and delicate of those that divide men of lifelong habit and skill in historical criticism, are settled off-hand, and flung by the ill-trained upon the untrained. On a higher stage, publications like the "Encyclopedia Biblica" and the excellent translations of Messrs. Williams and Norgate make one class of critical results very accessible; while the amorphous and terrible style of the deeper thinking in Germany (where alone there is still real and deep thinking on the deepest themes both of thought and life) makes mere translation from that side impossible. The result is a wide unsettlement and confusion, a vague disbelief in the possibility of sound footing, a loss of evangelical certainty about beliefs still formally held, and much pain and grief to the true pastoral mind when it leaves academic contentions and turns its eye from the youth of the day to the men of the future. Which, it asks, is the more vital concern for the race: liberty or truth? Is truth more vital to liberty than liberty to truth? What is the kind of truth that makes the atmosphere of final truth? And what is the truth which is to carry the liberty of the next generation?

Such questions are bound to arise with growing force. And they must specially face those who have been in the vanguard of public liberty in truth's name. The Protestant Churches have, ever since Calvin's day, been the pioneers of public liberty. Puritanism is the mother church of Western democracy. How then are the more democratic Churches to bear themselves in the new phases into which both truth and freedom now pass? How shall the passion for political and social liberty behave in relation to theological liberty? For good or ill these questions begin to press. For ill, and little but ill, they are being precipitated. But there they are. Those most responsible for the situation may be (as often happens in history) below the situation they create. It is easy to uncork the bottle; any youth might snap its neck; it is another thing to control the genie who escapes. "*Du bist noch nicht der Mann den Teufel festzuhalten.*" And it may take all the king's horses and all the king's men to recover things, and then not without the loss of many a good soul.

πολλὰς θιφόμενος ψυχὰς ἅλβι προέλαφεν
Ἡρώδης.

Do we not need to address our minds to the clearing of the strategic question?

The liberty of the Church's thought has always been regarded by an evangelical faith as flowing from the higher spiritual liberty which makes the Church's distinctive life, being its subordinate and servant. From this much follows. It follows, of course, that liberty in both kinds must be kept in our sacred treasury, and guarded with all the vigilance which is ever the price of its possession and increase. But *distinguendum*. It is a minor part of this vigilance to be wary against those who would curtail our freedom from without; we have still more to turn our treasure over and examine it, lest moth or rust get into it from within. True freedom for humanity in all kinds is in the Church's trust. It can stand nowhere else but upon Redemption at last. It is a bought freedom, and bought for us. What would it matter to secure an outward freedom to range the domain of thought as we pleased, if the source of our inward and redeemed liberty were eaten away in the dungeons of Doubting Castle, or in the citadel of our own mean or guilty soul? Liberty is but a cloak if the freeman's soul is still unfree, his will masterless, and his quickened conscience his foe. *Sine ecclesia nulla salus.*

And yet there are signs that many are more interested in the outer ward of freedom than in the inmost keep. They care more for the liberty to make truth than for the truth that makes liberty. We have, through circumstances, become much obsessed with the idea of political liberty, which is really negative, and has no definite content; and we import into Church and Gospel this negative notion, and tend to regard liberty as the censor of authority instead of its action and its fruit. But this is to secularise the Church and dispower it. It is really to politicise and establish the Church in

a way far more subtle and fatal than Erastianism. It is to make it in its inmost place the victim of political ideas of freedom—mere negative freedom of thought and speech—and to neglect liberty at its positive, creative, spiritual spring. Political toleration within a State is one thing; evangelical comprehension within a Gospel Church is another. It follows other principles. Public toleration was won largely by undogmatic religion; but Christian liberty within the Church has a most positive base. Christian liberty in its centre and genius is not freedom from another, but freedom by another, and in another. It is not liberty to get rid of old truths, but to move-freely in them. It is not freedom to know and judge, but (if we will be thorough) it is the freedom that consists in being known, yea searched, yea judged, yea condemned—unto mercy and unto Christ. The New Testament knows nothing explicitly of the liberty to pursue truth. That blessing is of science and the modern age. It is not religious in its historic origin. And, in so far as it is religious at all it is the inevitable, but indirect result of another and greater liberty, which *is* that of the New Testament, the liberty that truth must pursue because truth first creates it. Free thought is not a primary Christian interest. Historically it belongs to Illumination rather than to Revelation. It is, indeed, a real Christian interest, for whose discovery the Church that has appropriated it owes much to science. And there are junctures when for the moment it must become the ruling interest, even for the Church. But in the Christian scale of moral values it is secondary. It is a splendid by-product, like philanthropy. And what is primary is the free, the saved, the re-created personality, the soul morally free, and not only psychologically free, before the judgment of God, free in the sense of being redeemed and regenerate in Christ. The very essence of Christianity is that moral freedom of the new creature, that spiritual elation of External Life, that expansion of the whole personality, wherein thought itself begins to dilate, unfold and germinate, until the whole world stands out in a new and glorious construction, vistas open, and all things fall into the constellations of a new heaven and earth because Christ lives in us. The record of the race's mightiest mind, written by the shining track of Christian theology, shows that thought receives an impulse and an aptitude from regeneration and faith that could never be given it by a renaissance, by knowledge and its passion alone. We do not only develop the thought we inherit; but the world is lighted up for us anew, new shores bask in a new sun, and thought itself appears but as a scheme in a vaster system of systems. "All about us is a spiritual world "compared with which the present generation is as a family of ants "in London." Discovery itself is felt to be a work of grace. It is given rather than found; it is inspiration before it is discovery; and the great inventions find us rather than we find them. God takes all our knowledge and all our thought, and, instead of drawing these

out step by step in an evolutionary series like the sun upon a rose, He treats them as the keys of a piano, composes at the instrument, so to say, and by the magic of His spirit combines them into a totally new scheme, a new genus of thought, which we do not shape, which rather shapes and uses us, which is not a genetic product of what was already in us, but a new creation by the Master Spirit.* Such, indeed, is the nature of all genial and synthetic thought as distinct from that which is rigid, deductive or analytic. It is pre-eminently the genius of Christian thought. It is creative from a source even more than evolutionary from a series.

It is often pointed out that freedom of thought, in any sense other than freedom from violence to the thinker, is a contradiction in terms, that thought is, of all our functions, the least free, and the most bound to conform to its corresponding and creative reality (*i.e.*, to its authority) if it is to be true. From which it would seem to follow that in this region freedom is a thing entirely conditioned by the nature of its authority, of the reality to which it answers and owes its being. The lower thought is wholly conditioned by *things*, by the facts concerned; the higher thought by another order and value of fact, with another calculus, by creative, authoritative *persons*, and their acts. It is the truth (*i.e.*, in the New Testament usage, the reality) that makes us free, and our freedom is entirely according as we are in contact with the reality, and according as the reality is which we touch. As evangelical Christians we are to stand fast not simply in liberty (which would be poisoning ourselves in the air), but in the liberty corresponding to our moral reality, and our moral situation; the liberty where-with Christ made us free; not in the liberty He preached, but in the liberty He wrought and brought. We stand in the liberty, that is, of no natural freedom, whether in act or thought, but of redemption; a freedom which no man has any right to claim, which is entirely a charism and gift of grace. It is a matter of submission and not of demand. No Church can be founded on mere liberty and its rights; the Church everywhere stands on complete redemption, and on the absolute monarchy of Christ, before whom we have no rights, and in whom we have all. Free thought, which is a prime right between man and man in nature, has another place in a church of grace; it is a fruit, as I have said, and even a regulated product, of the spirit of our redemption. In politics it is a principle, in religion it is not a principle, but only the fruit of a principle which, as experiential, is much more searching and creative for the personality than any rational freedom. Free thought is not the spirit, in the sense of being the essence of Christianity; like the Christian temper, it is only a fruit of the spirit, and therefore has its times and seasons. It is not the liberty of the Gospel, which is a

* The image is Rothe's, though not the phrasing.

soul's evangelical freedom, confidence, and completeness before a judging and redeeming God. Evangelical experimental freedom is one thing, as the new life; and theological rational freedom is another, as a part of science. And as within an evangelical church theology must be second to life, to the new life and its experiences, therefore theological freedom must always be limited by the Gospel that makes a Church a Church, makes it live, and makes its life free. Theology in a university, as an academic science, has a freedom (and a feebleness) which it can have in no Church. A Church of free thought would be no Church at all, but the most sectarian of sects, and the most scholastic of schools. There is something almost boyish in the aggressive use of a pulpit for a free thought propaganda.

Thus the freedom of the Free Churches in particular is neither free thought nor freedom from establishment, in the first place. With the whole Church, they rest on regeneration. Only not on a baptismal regeneration, but on an ethical and experiential. There they have their charter. Therefore they stand to say that the true limit of spiritual liberty can only be found in its new creative source. It is not a vague expansiveness. The Lord is its righteousness. A positive Gospel is its own norm. Living faith is autonomous and prescribes its own liberty by its objective content. The freedom of the Free Churches is regulated by this evangelical freedom, this conferred, this donated freedom of the soul in which there is now by grace no condemnation, but confidence before God, being freely justified through the redemption in Jesus Christ. Every particular assertion of freedom, whether against Orthodoxy or Establishment, is only a particular aspect, at a special historic juncture, of that Free Grace, which put the Free Churches there, and which they only exist to preach and represent. To abandon that is to go outside them. To attack that is to turn and rend them. To attack it from within is to betray them. They are evangelical or nothing. And their noble ardour for public or intellectual freedom is yet the zeal only for a means and not an end, for a certain creation and fruit of the Gospel, which is not to be confused with the Gospel itself. Theological freedom in the Church only exists to give scope neither to reason nor to an individual, but to the Gospel. In the State, in a university created by the State, it is otherwise; there it is simply part of the freedom of all knowledge.

There was a time when the historical duty laid on the Free Churches was the assertion, in and out of season, of their liberty either in the region of opinion, or in relation to the State. And though in some of the non-Established Churches that victory has not been wholly won, yet, so far as opinion goes, it is won in the main. But in those Churches where it is not wholly won, where it was being won, it suffers, for the present, a setback. Progressive theology has received a severe chill. And the chief

reason is that we have been passing into circumstances which raise a new issue, and which thrust to the front a greater cause than freedom, the cause that freedom only exists to serve, the very existence of the truth which makes us free and is the charter of our freedom. The supreme sense of this new and positive issue has come home to the Churches that were but partially liberalised, and it has arrested the emancipation by impressing them with the prior necessity of a definite Gospel to protect freedom from itself. We are called on to answer a new question, not "What is liberty?" but, "What defines it? What is its saving limit? What secures it? What is your saving bond?" Not, "How broad are you, how liberal, how human?" but, "What is your base? What is the reason for your existence? What is the source of your power and the goal of your freedom?" It is well that a Church should be broad, and it must be humane; but it is first essential that it should have, broad or narrow, a ground of existence, an explicit, positive and honest gospel, as a permanent source of moral power and spiritual creation. It is the same question as we have to put to Catholic Modernism: "What exactly is the fixed deposit of Faith, the germinal revelation from which you start to develop all the theology where you claim to be free and adjustable to each age? What is it, within the developing Church, that is given us to develop? You repudiate the idea of a restatement of doctrine; what is it you claim to re-interpret? Is it a few compendious truths, or is it God himself, who, in one historic person has given himself supreme expression and final effect by one eternal act?"

In the region of the State freedom of thought has been entirely secured. Yet if a man believed the assassination of its head to be a moral virtue, and an indispensable condition of full liberty, and if he started on a public apostolate of that view, even though he might not incite anybody in a direct way, the State would soon clip his liberty's wings. There are things of first moment to the very existence of the State, matters where opinion (or at least its public expression) is not free, and should not be free; where liberty is not absolute, but the community, its order, its security and its future is supreme. So it is in the freest States. And so also it must be in the Church, even in the most generous Church, whether the pressure be applied by statutory means, or by public opinion and the decent sense of what is honourable in a man that wears the community's name and enjoys its emolument, protection, or prestige. We must have a gospel more precious than freedom if we are to have freedom precious, and keep it so. If we are sure about our gospel it will see to our liberty; but we have no guarantee that a preoccupation with liberty will leave us with a gospel. The truth in its reality will make us free. Amongst

the great notes of the Church as One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic the note of freedom is absent. And the reason is that a Church of real unity, sanctity, catholicity and evangelical apostolicity will never be to seek at last in the only freedom for which a Church need supremely care. Only a freedom secured by the Gospel gives the very sappers of the Gospel liberty to countermine.

Secure upon the Eternal rock
The eternal city stands.

Whatever, therefore, be the actual clamour, the real demand of the hour upon the Church has ceased to be for a wide Church and a comprehensive, in the external sense of that word. What the spiritual situation calls for is not a Church broad in the sense of a theological sheet let down from heaven whose colours have run owing to the mish-mash of the contents. What is required is a Church broad, not because of the ground it has to cover, or the crowd it includes, but because of the height, the weight, it has to carry. It is a Church whose breadth is determined by its height, and not its height by its breadth. A Church which is all breadth and no height is not the new Jerusalem, nor any reflection, nor any development of it. The Church of Christ is primarily determined not by the needs of men, but by the power of a holy God to meet them. Thus the question of the hour to the Church is "What is your Gospel?"; it is not "What is your domain?" It is, "What is your power?"; it is not, "What is your range?" If we see to the power, that will see to the range and freedom. We are asked by the people we need attend to most, not "How much can you believe, or fit into such belief as you have?" but, "What do you trust? Whom do you trust? What stays you? Where do you get and give real strength, in face of your fellows, your past, your conscience, and your judge? What right have you to call that judge Father? What right had Jesus to give you that right? What brings the cheer that overcomes the world?" These questions about reality and power now take precedence of the questions about freedom. The actual, internal, disquieting condition of the Churches demands that change of concern.

For in the days when our battle was for a freedom now mainly won, the Churches were solid, as they have now, for a variety of causes, ceased to be. The Churches that fought freedom's battle were cohesively evangelical (however sectarian) in the main. (I say in the main, because I recognise the great contribution of those who were honestly and avowedly Unitarians.) But we have to contemplate the possibility of a day arriving when the Free Churches should not all be solidly evangelical. Some might be more concerned about theological liberty than about evangelical power, or piety to the past; or they might be more governed by personal

sympathies than by public principle, and by fair humanities than by positive belief. They might plead their creedless liberty; overlooking the fact that a creedless liberty would neither have arisen nor continued except on the basis of a tacit covenant* and honourable understanding as to evangelical fidelity. In the absence of such an understanding the existence of an express creed might be the lesser evil. Ecclesiastical liberty of the non-confessional kind could be abused in the Socinian interest as truly as female immunity from severe assault is presumed on by the ladies who destroy the liberty of public meeting.

For instance, to repudiate the doctrines of grace in any real sense of them, or to treat Christ's sinlessness as but relative, or to describe His humanity as essential but His increate deity as not, and to do so in an aggressive and even offensive way—would that be a fair and lawful course within a communion which is evangelical or nothing, with all its liberty? Would it not be making the principles of social toleration those of evangelical liberty, which has another basis, and one far more positive? Is the normal shedding of eccentricities persecution? Would such latitude not mean more concern for an indefinite liberty than for a positive Gospel? The focus of a Church is not liberty but faith. We are not saved by our liberty, but by the Gospel for liberty. Is there a Christian limit of belief? There is no doubt, in the minds of those most competent to judge, that some rationalist positions are quite incompatible, not only with the message of the Church, but with even the most hospitable version of a Catholic and New Testament Christianity. There must, of course, be much latitude, else there could be no reform or progress from within. But the ministry at least should be less seekers than finders and founders. And one would ask those vivid and generous minds that are attracted, first, by the apparent simplicity and laicity of these vague positions, and, second, by the ardour of liberty, to consider the larger and ampler bearings of the situation, to take long views of things and see them whole. For the essence of rationalism is to be one-sided, and its simplicity is too easy to be full and free. May the liberty claimed in this case not go so far as to be really a claim for liberty to adopt another religion, an illuminate Judaism? That is an indubitable public liberty, but is it so within the first religion? Should it not be frankly and straightly claimed for what it is, if it know its own mind, and if it is as intelligent as it would be free?

To take but one central point. Is it possible that Jesus Christ should at once be but the first and greatest subject of the Christian faith, and also the object of that Christian faith and worship, that He should be at once but the chief believer and also the object of belief? Is it possible that a religion which only worships God in

*In America this is express, and is assumed at entrance on membership.

the way Jesus did should be identical with a religion which worships Jesus as God? Is it possible to identify a religion which only imitates the personal piety of Jesus, and approaches God kneeling *beside or behind* Him in filial trust, with a religion which approaches God by kneeling *before* Jesus? Is it possible in the same religion to treat Jesus but as the prophet or organ of our forgiveness and at the same time the ground of it, nay as our forgiveness itself? I do not for the moment ask which is right. I only ask if these dilemmas can be felt compatible by any other means than by ceasing to think Christ may either be fully worshipped as God or only revered as man. But surely if He should only be revered as divine Humanity it is idolatry, it is another religion, to do as Christendom has done and worship Him under the only condition that justifies worship—as the Co-eternal Son of the Eternal Father. Even if we do as the Arians did, who were killing Catholic Christianity in the fourth century but for Athanasius, and English Christianity in the eighteenth but for the Evangelical revival, even if we allow Christ a premundane existence and a certain occultation or kenosis, we may still be regarding Him but as the pre-existence of a created Humanity, however much older than time. He is no Eternal Being and no infinite Love. *Erat quando non erat*. There was a time when he was not. And he has then no claim to our worship in a religion which will worship only the increate as God, and finds sin so serious as to be forgiven only by the kenosis of such an increate and inexhaustible Redeemer. Whereas if sin be but a peripheral affair there is no adequate motive for the kenosis of a being with the divine intimacy of even an Arian Christ. At any rate, such a Christ is still (however greatly) "just man"; he is not God, however divine. He is first among the worshippers, and not the goal of the worship. At most He is a middle being. He does not rise above the nature of a demiurge. And Protestant Christianity recognises no worship of middle beings, nor does even Roman Christianity admit more than their adoration and invocation.

We might extend the range of alternative. Is it possible to think that they are the same religion—that which trusts wholly to the words and teachings of one supreme, though dubious, spiritual hero, Jesus ("just a man among men, but "what a man"!) about God the All-Father, and that which commits our whole soul and self to the hands of this Jesus for all Eternity, and does this so absolutely that we glory more in being His bond-slaves than in all the freedom of our thought, the manhood of our haughty self-respect, or the pride of our wonderful, exquisite race? Or is the religion which finds the Christian centre of

* It is quite true to say that forgiveness is ours upon true repentance without more ado. But only if Christ in His cross is the forgiveness presented us by God, and producing the repentance.

gravity in the teaching of Jesus alone the same as that which finds it in His death? Or is the religion which finds in Christ's death but an incidental and impressionist martyrdom the same with that which finds in it the one atonement, and the one ground in God of our Eternal hope? The latter, right or wrong, is Evangelical Christianity. Is the difference a shade within the same religion? Again, is the religion which finds the heavenly Christ to be but an idea that was tacked on by an apostle to an earthly Jesus (who may now be dead or alive) one religion with that which regards the heavenly Christ as the earthly Jesus in a continuous but victorious personality, risen, ascended, and acting, not only as our closest friend, but as the most august, mighty, and effectual of contemporary sovereigns in every age? The latter is Evangelical Christianity; what is the former? Is the religion which regards salvation as the spiritual development (through many venial slips) of Humanity's innate powers under the lead of commanding personalities—is that religion one with the religion which makes everything, for Eternity, turn on the power given by the one redemptive person and crisis of the cross? Is the religion which says that redemption was a gnostic idea imported into the religion of Jesus by the mystifications of Paul one with the religion either of the New Testament or of Christendom? The most advanced criticism of the *Religions-geschichtler* now leaves Harnack far behind. It says that almost all the New Testament outside the Synoptics represents the simple religion of Jesus as perverted and mystified from the Orient by Apostolism long before it was actually Hellenised and secularised from the West by Catholicism. Can that be one religion, with the faith which worships the whole New Testament Christ? Or, again, within the Synoptics, can a religion which makes Jesus sub-historical, by a criticism more solvent than constructive, be one with a religion which makes Him not only historic, but super-historic by living faith, the faith of a permanent living communion with Him? Could these two views continue to live

* It may be pointed out how unstable is the equilibrium of this position. Its first and inevitable result for religious experience is that the saving value is transferred, almost unwittingly, from the historic Jesus to the Logos Christ. The second result is that each of these evaporates. The saving power becomes a mystic rationality, and the historic figure then dissolves in the severance. The Gospels are reduced by the criticism of vigour and rigour, till nothing is left standing but Schmiedel's ninepins, while with van Maanen, every one of the Pauline letters is taken from Paul and assigned to a more sophisticated stage in the history of faith. Can these positions possibly be adjusted to the religion which worships Jesus both as Christ and God? And would it be fair to use the confidence of an unwitting public in the one religion and its exponents to destroy it by the other?

The personal plety of many who hold these non-Christian views might be undeniable. But that is not the question, except with a hopeless individualism and empiricism. These critics may go on in the living power of what they have renounced. The question is neither of individuals nor of their subjective religion, but of the relation of the teaching to the conditions of its exercise as interpreted by the general Christian mind of the community concerned. It is a question of objective revelation, of the Church at large and its ministry, of what the great Church stands for to the world; and of the effect on the Church in a few generations of cherishing within it another faith than that which made it.

honestly in the same house? Or, again, is the religion, which in defiance of the whole central conscience of the Church, regards sin as a mere tangential concern of God's one with a religion which regards it as no less than death to God unless it be mastered and destroyed by the crisis of His life—even His—in His cross? Is a religion which treats sin as a factor in God's creation the same religion as that which makes it the one thing that would destroy creation if it did not compel creative resource to rise to redemption? Can one side of these alternatives be treated by any logic, as the development of the other and its liberal version? Now, unless religious impressionism or mawkish charity is to become our standard of reality and truth, unless we abolish every objective standard, make liberty our God, and *Δῖνος βασιλεὺς* of demos, must we not one day face such alternatives instead of blurring and belittling them? We must not hurry them; but will time, will candour not force them? Would that not be the only real hope of exit from the slough of confused sensibility and genial impotence into which churches might glide, as if they were no longer facing the Lord's controversy, and making the great world-choice, but gliding down "smooth-sliding Mincius crowned with vocal reeds" to a social mirage?

But if issues were raised so clear as these (and they are not yet so clear), and so fatally incompatible, would it be the hour to talk of decided protest as an invasion of liberty? Or, if it were so deemed, then would not liberty have taken, in the minds of those who thus reckon, the place that only belongs to the Lord and Giver of the liberty? Would not arbitrary freedom have taken the place of the Gospel in our religion, and of the authority of the Gospel? Or would not personal consideration have displaced fidelity to Christ? The demand of Christ upon the Church of the hour is for a witness to the power and reality of the Gospel rather than to a spendthrift breadth or a suffused sympathy. And such a witness is required for the sake of liberty itself, to save it from the sophistications which, even in fine spirits, amid a complex age, can so easily beset its noble name. The Church of a real Gospel is called to something more than a vague zeal for liberty as an unchartered freedom. It is called to throw its weight upon the positive Evangel which makes it free. For liberty itself could become an idol, and could be used for a cloak to hide the poverty of our faith, and to express a sympathy too soft to be firm or true.

Were such an issue ever raised some would, no doubt, call for heroic measures. But there is no health in party passion or faction fight. Excommunication is not a living way. It would mean that we had more faith in an official scrutiny by the Church than in the spiritual methods of winnowing by the Word, sifting by its Spirit, and selection by its affinities. Heresy-hunting, also, postulates an

orthodoxy which now exists only in the Highlands or a standard only kept at the Vatican. Besides, it has been discovered, ever since the Robertson Smith case, to be the best of advertisements for the heretic, or even the adventurer, now that there is a popular press which finds him far better copy than the apostle. Scientific argument among the competent, and fraternal discussion among the brotherly are better means. The word can be trusted to the Church. All the more, of course, must the issue be clarified, if such a crisis ever arose, in aid of the tender conscience and confused mind of some who might be uneasy about renouncing and even denouncing the doctrines of Grace from within an Evangelical Church. But amid that clarifying let the wheat and the tares grow together. These tares are not there without God, when we know the devout life, spiritual sensibility, and generous sympathies of many once accounted tares. The penumbra of Evangelical Christendom contains many in it who have suffered noble pain in truth's quest, and silent martyrdom for their witness to it as they conceived it. Were the essence of Christianity the quest of truth and the exercise of conscientious fortitude, such men would be apostles. There will always be high-minded men who feel bound to consider whether intellectual freedom and unlimited comprehension may not be too dearly bought at the cost of moral delicacy and the point of honour. Nothing can really be done for true liberty from a position which scandalises the public conscience. It is this, perhaps, which has caused the disappearance of the Broad Church party as a party in the Church of the Prayer Book.* Nothing discounts a liberator in such matters like a practical lack of ethical sensibility. Matters may in general be left to the good feeling of the honourable, as soon as the note, genius, and tradition of their community have become clear.

It may only be indicated in closing that a creedless church (in the sense of a Church without a formula of subscription) will be found by Christendom a bane or a boon according as its motive is an indifference to definite belief or a concern for a rich variety of belief definite and positive. What is certain, if the history of Christianity prove anything, is that without the theology of an atoning cross criticism of Christ or laudation of Him gets the better of worship or even reverence; Christian faith cannot survive; and Christian ethic has no foundation in God. Subjective faith cannot last without objective. Faith as a frame of mind cannot endure without a faith in which to believe. The notion of faith can only live upon the content of faith. The *fides qua creditur* dies without the *fides quae creditur*, however that may be recast. We must always have what our fathers had—the grace of God, its ground in Christ, and its grasp in faith. If the world's moral need were ever driven to choose

* In the Lutheran Church the strain has become very severe in some cases.

between a rationalised sentimentalised Protestantism and Rome, it is to Rome it would fall, because of the objective and evangelical element which rationalism destroys but which Romanism only perverts.

One other remark. It has been said that the creeds represent extravagances and eccentricities imported into a simple Christianity. But to the historic eye it is rather the other way. They represent on the whole the growing corporate life which normally shed the raw gnostic extravagances of youth. Unfortunately they came to be canonised in perpetuity, and used as means of oppression and obscurantism by their *epigoni*. And it was to prevent such abuse that churches arose in which the form of faith was non-confessional, based on an honest evangelical understanding, which was declaratory at most, and not exclusive. It is wonderful how successful this has been, and how the evangelical genius of Christianity in these Churches and their steady expansion has lived down the sports which from time to time appeared, and has absorbed the new truth. The record is one of unity and growth in the Gospel. But of course if such trustful freedom became an evangelical failure, there is a natural danger that many minds would for practical purposes turn from an internal to an external authority, and would return to the idea of a brief and revisable creed which should be of obligation, as the only means of saving the Churches from dissolving into star dust and luminous mist.

P. T. FORSYTH

THE GROWTH OF THE WORLD.

PROFESSOR SEELEY has related, in an admirable little book, the Story of the Expansion of England. But no one, it is believed, has ever ventured to address himself, in a brief compass, to a much larger topic, and to call attention to that which, for want of a better name, may be styled the growth of the world. Yet history is almost unintelligible unless we realise how small the world, or what men called the world, was in the good old days when Homer sang and Herodotus wrote. We can hardly realise why Power has marched from East to West, from South to North, unless we form a clear idea of the successive additions which have been made to man's knowledge of the surface of the Earth.

In one sense, no doubt, the very title of this article is a misnomer. It is almost as inaccurate to talk of the growth of the world as of the growth of the universe. Infinity cannot grow; and, except for the slight additions which it may have received from the accretion of meteoric dust, this world of ours is neither larger nor heavier than when it was first launched into space millions of years ago. But, in another sense, both the universe and the world, or, rather, man's knowledge both of the Universe and of the World have grown and are still growing. The telescope and other contrivances have added and are adding whole regions to Infinity. And the discoveries of bold men have added and are adding new lands and new seas to this little planet of ours which we call the world.

Let us consider for one moment what the idea of the world was, not, indeed, at the earliest period of which we have any knowledge, but at the dawn of written history, or of written history among that Indo-Germanic people whose descendants have overspread so much of the earth. The world of Homer was a small flat surface, in which civilisation was hemmed in by foreign races, who again were surrounded by a great ocean or river, over which no man had ever passed. The world of which Homer had any definite notion was

Greece—a Greece which hardly extended as far as the Balkans on the North, and which scarcely included the Levant and the islands in the Ægean Sea. No doubt he had some general acquaintance with a world beyond these narrow limits. He knew, at any rate, some of the leading features of Northern Africa. He had heard, as was only natural, of Egypt, whose civilisation had made such marked advances and was exercising so much influence. He had some knowledge of the great river, on whose recurring floods Egypt depends for her prosperity. He had even heard of the Pygmies and of the Ethiopians who dwelt higher up its stream. Some reports had reached him of Southern Italy. But it is hopeless to attempt to fit the geography of Homer to the actual facts. If a man were to search to-day for the precise spot on which Captain Lemuel Gulliver was wrecked in the first of his famous voyages, he would find that the Lilliput of Swift was in the heart of Australia: and much in the same way, to quote Mr. Gladstone's language, "the key to the great contrast between the outer geography [of Homer] and the facts of Nature lies in the belief of Homer that a great sea occupied the space where we know the heart of the European continent to lie."

It is another indication of the smallness of Homer's world that the ten years' war—of which he has given us the concluding episode—was not, as even Herodotus has described it, one of the opening chapters of the great struggle which has endured throughout historic times between East and West: but a contest between men of common origin. It is not a mere poetical license which makes Greeks and Romans address one another in the same language. Yet the world of Homer, small as it seems to us, seemed large to him. Compared with the mighty oceans which men now traverse, the Mediterranean is but a little land-locked sea. The Mediterranean of the *Iliad* was only the Ægean, yet for Homer it had terrors which the Atlantic has not for us.

A length of ocean and unbounded sky
Which scarce the sea-fowl in a year o'erfly.

Let us now come down 500 years in history. The intervening centuries have enlarged the range of man's knowledge. Anaximander has made the first rude map; Hicetæus has composed the first geographical treatise; and Pythagoras and his followers have introduced "a cosmical philosophy somewhat more approaching to the truth." Thus the world of Herodotus is bounded by a larger horizon than the world of Homer. In Herodotus' time the Persian Empire—the country of the Great King—was a fact which no Greek was able to ignore. A man who had lived in the age of Marathon, of Salamis and of Platæa was not likely to overlook an Empire which had threatened to flood the Grecian world; and a

* Bunbury "*History of Ancient Geography*," Vol. I., p. 122.

knowledge of the Persian Empire necessarily led to some acquaintance with more distant countries. For before the time of Herodotus the Scythians had penetrated into Asia. And Darius, before he marched southwards on Greece, had marched northwards on Scythia. Egypt, too, which had been absorbed by the power of Persia, and which was being drawn into closer relations with Greece, was acquiring distinctness in the Greek mind. The knowledge of it, and the foundation of Cyrene, were adding a third continent—Africa—to the two which had only previously been recognised. The enterprising spirit of Phœnician and Greek merchants was, moreover, extending the knowledge of mankind. The traffic with the East, which made the Jews under Solomon so prosperous, was bringing wealth to Tyre. Bold Phœnician sailors had pushed along the shores of the outer Mediterranean, had passed the Straits of Gibraltar, and had penetrated to the coast of Cornwall in one direction and to the Canary Islands in the other. They had established colonies in Northern Africa and Southern Spain, and they were on friendly terms with some of the earlier settlers in Central Italy. Greek colonists, emulating their example, were founding colonies both in the Euxine and in the Mediterranean. They had already settled in the country which was to be known as *Magna Græcia*, in Southern Italy, in Sicily, in Southern France and in Spain: and in Sicily they were strong enough to defeat Africa at Himera on the day on which their kinsfolk triumphed over Asia at Salamis.

Thus in the centuries which had elapsed from the time of Homer to the time of Herodotus scholars and merchants were acquiring familiarity with a larger world. But the knowledge which scholars and merchants were gaining was not shared by the people generally. When, indeed, the Greeks, after the battle of Salamis, were urged by some of the bolder spirits among them to follow up the victory by passing over to Ionia, they could not be persuaded to advance beyond Delos. Samos, which lies off the coast of Asia Minor, opposite Ephesus, seemed to their exaggerated fears as far off as the pillars of Hercules. And the ignorance of the cultured few was almost as great as that of the uncultivated many. To a Greek, as afterwards to a Roman mind, the land-locked sea which Greek and Phœnician navigators were exploring was the Mediterranean, the centre of the earth. Sardinia was described as the largest island in the world. Even of the Mediterranean world much was still unknown. In 450 B.C., when Herodotus was writing, Rome was passing from her legendary to her historic period. She had expelled the Tarquins half a century before: she was to be burned by the Gauls half a century later. Her growing power was already foreshadowing her future greatness. Yet Rome is not once mentioned by Herodotus; and so ignorant was he of the existence of a rising power in the West that he makes Xerxes say to the Persians, on the eve of his

great expedition, that if he could conquer Athens and Phrygia, "we shall extend the Persian territory as far as God's heaven reaches." "For," he adds, "if [the Athenians and Phrygians] are once swept away, there is no city, no country left in all the world which will venture so much as to withstand us in arms."

Outside the limits of the Mediterranean basin Herodotus' ignorance of Europe was profound. Though he had seen the amber, which must have been brought from the Baltic by traders who had traversed and retraversed the unknown districts of Central Europe, he could write: "The boundaries of Europe are quite unknown; and there is not a man who can say whether any sea girds it round on the North or on the East."

He says elsewhere: "Of the extreme tracts of Europe towards the East I cannot speak with any certainty. For I do not allow that there is any river to which the Barbarians give the name of Eridanus, emptying itself into the Northern Sea, whence, as the tale goes, amber is procured. Nor do I know of any islands called the Cassiterides, whence the tin comes which we use. For, in the first place, the name Eridanus is manifestly not a barbarian word at all, but a Greek name, invented by some poet or other; and, secondly, though I have taken vast pains, I have never been able to get an assurance from an eye-witness that there is any sea on the further side of Europe. Nevertheless, tin and amber certainly do come to us from the ends of the earth."

In fact, in Herodotus' time a little more was known of the shape of Africa than of the shape of Europe. Herodotus, indeed, did not wholly accept the story of the circumnavigation of Africa by Phœnician sailors under Necho's order. The circumstance which makes it credible to the modern mind makes the credulous historian doubt. Some modern critics have shared the doubts of the Father of History; and the extreme length of the voyage, which is said to have been protracted over nearly three years, may perhaps justify their hesitation. Whether this famous voyage actually took place or not, however, the men who related it must, at any rate, have had a shrewd idea that Africa was circumnavigable. And the *Periplus* of Hanno must have done much to confirm the impression. Hanno, indeed, starting from the Straits of Gibraltar, did not succeed in doubling the Cape of Good Hope. But he sailed southwards, probably to near the Equator, and the narration of his experiences, which has come down to us, contains strong internal evidence of its truth.

Let us now travel down another three centuries of history. The world which we have just been contemplating has both grown and changed. It has grown; for the expeditions of Xenophon and the conquests of Alexander have given size and precision to men's ideas of the East. It has changed; for the world owns as its mistress a city on the Tiber, as to which, as we have already seen, Herodotus

is silent. The whole aspect is affected by the change. Greece had looked eastwards. She had turned, in the hours of her alarm and of her victory, to the rising sun. But Rome looked westwards. The great struggle with the Phœnician colony, Carthage, had led to the conquest, first by Carthage, afterwards by Rome, of the whole of Spain. The Mediterranean, still the centre of the known world, had assumed its modern shape. Consular Rome was virtually the sole mistress of its shores.

The world, then, at the time at which we have now arrived, had annexed Hindostan on the East and the Spanish Peninsula on the West. But no other large additions had been made to man's knowledge of geography. The world, however, with which we are now dealing had one striking characteristic. It possessed only one great power. The prediction of the Magi to Xerxes that all mankind would become his servants had at last been fulfilled in the case of Rome. The peace which occurred after the Macedonian wars was really due to the circumstance that there was no power in the known world strong enough to contend with the Romans. There was—so a Roman would arrogantly have said—no inhabited portion of the earth over which the power of Rome did not extend. The census of which we read in the second chapter of St. Luke, a century and a half afterwards, was to be taken through *πασάν τὴν δικουμένην*, the whole inhabited world. Our word Catholic represents the same idea of an Empire or Church spreading over the whole world, while the conception of a universal empire which was to make war impossible by placing all peoples under one rule descended, through Charlemagne, to the old German Empire.

The world of the Roman Consulate, however, was a very different world from that which we know. It was the world which surrounded the Mediterranean Sea. Of the civilisations which had already been established both in North and South America, in Mexico and in Peru, the Roman, of course, had no knowledge. Of the teeming millions in China he had scarcely heard. Of the great countries of modern Europe—France, Germany and Great Britain—he knew less than we know now of the valleys of the Nile, the Niger and the Congo.

This ignorance was the more remarkable because trade had already established imperfect relations with many other countries. Solomon, depend upon it, was not the only monarch who had his ships in the Red Sea, or whose caravans brought gold and spices, ivory and precious stones from the distant East. Caravans were already passing through the whole length of Asia to China, and after a journey of eight months bringing back the Chinese silk which found its way to Rome by the time of Virgil.* In the third century before Christ,

* "Velleraque ut foliis defectant tenula Seres."

moreover, Pytheas, a native of Marseilles, had passed through the Straits of Gibraltar, cruised along the coasts of Western Europe, crossed over to Britain, sailed along the shore of our own Island, and claimed that he had discovered another island to the North, to which he had given the name of Thule. In returning he had passed over the German Ocean to Scandinavia, and by the shores of Germany and Holland, to the French and Spanish coasts. The discoveries of Pytheas, however, which have only come down to us at second hand, were disbelieved by his contemporaries and immediate successors. It required centuries of experience to prove that the stories, which the ancient critics regarded as idle tales, were founded on truth. The personal narratives of travellers in all ages have been regarded from the same standpoint; and critics who were not lawyers, like Lord Plunket who was a lawyer, have claimed the lawyer's privilege of distinguishing between personal and real.

Yet, while Pytheas was adding to the possible knowledge of mankind by his voyages, in the succeeding generation a greater man than Pytheas was destined to found the whole science of geology. Sir E. Bunbury has given an excellent account of the work of Eratosthenes. He "adopted the views that were current among the "astronomers of his day, which had been received almost without "exception from the times of Aristotle and Euclid. He regarded "the earth as a sphere, placed in the centre of the universe. With "an approach to accuracy which is surprising, considering the "deficiency of his knowledge, he calculated the greater circumference "of the earth at 250,000 Stadia or 25,000 English miles. He "declared the length of the known world from the Atlantic to the "Eastern Ocean to be 78,000 Stadia, its breadth from the parallel "of the Cinnamon Land to that of Thule to be 38,000 Stadia. He "conceived that the remaining portion was occupied by a great ocean, "and he anticipated Columbus by saying that 'if it were not that "the vast extent of the Atlantic Sea rendered it impossible, one might "even sail from the coast of Spain to that of India along the same "parallel.' " *

Yet the ideas of Eratosthenes, if they were accepted in the educated atmosphere of Alexandria, made little or no impression on men's minds. Christianity, three centuries after Eratosthenes, was constructed on the old ideas which had come down from antiquity. "The "orthodox faith," said Gibbon,† "confined the habitable world to "one temperate zone, and represented the earth as an oblong surface "400 days' journey in length, 200 in breadth, encompassed by the "ocean, and covered by the solid crystal of the Firmament." The same idea in an exaggerated form is familiar to us from the Gospel narrative. "The devil, taking Him up into an high mountain, showed

* "History of Ancient Geography," Vol. I., pp. 619, 621, 626.

† Gibbon, Vol. VII., p. 100.

"unto Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time."
It lingered nearly seventeen centuries later in the lines of Dryden:—

Then we upon our globe's vast verge shall go,
And view the ocean leaning on the sky;
From thence our rolling neighbours we shall know
And on the lunar world securely pry.

It still occasionally finds expression in our own century. A school-master in Australia, for example, giving a lesson in geology, turned round to an English visitor with an apology for teaching his boys that the earth was round. "I am obliged to do so, sir, because the books say so. But you and I, who have travelled all the way from England, know that the books are wrong. We have seen that the earth is flat."

The scientific view of Eratosthenes, like the popular view of the Gospel, equally confined the habitable world to only a small part of the earth's surface. And even of this part an accurate knowledge did not extend beyond the limits of Southern and Western Asia and the countries adjoining the Mediterranean. But events were already in progress which were to enlarge the horizon. Behind the screens of the Pyrenees, the Alps and the Balkans, which shut out the chief parts of modern Europe from the Roman world, whole nations had long been settled which had attained a civilisation of their own. It is impossible, in the present place, to enter into the story of the successive peoples who had swept over the countries which we now know as Germany and France. They had driven the Iberians or Basques, who had been their immediate predecessors, into the less accessible portions of Spain, or to remoter parts of South-Western France. In Spain, indeed, Celt and Iberian had mingled in marriage, and a mixed race of Celt-Iberian had been formed. In Switzerland, in France, and in the Low Countries, the Celt alone held undisputed supremacy. Whether, in the second century before Christ, their sway extended beyond the Rhine, it is difficult to determine. But there can be little doubt that time was when they were as powerful in Eastern as in Western Europe. One of their tribes, indeed, swept down the valley of the Danube, crossed the Dardanelles, ravaged Asia Minor, and finally settled in Galatia, which, like Gallia, is the country of the *κέλται*. At a still earlier period another tribe had crossed the Alps and occupied Northern Italy, which the Romans knew as Cisalpine Gaul. At the beginning of the fourth century before Christ the Celts attacked Rome and burned the city. The citadel was saved by the intrepidity of Manlius and the exertions of Camillus.

No historian has recorded the rise and progress of the Celtic race, and we are apt to fasten on particular passages in Roman literature to justify the common presumption that the Celts were an ill-armed,

ill-organised and barbarous people. Yet the reverse is probably much nearer to the truth. Mommsen regards as "not quite an exaggeration" the statement that one tribe alone, the Arverni, who were settled in Auvergne, could bring an army of 180,000 men into the field. He goes on to speak of the magnificence of their king, and he adds that "the numerous Arvernian gold coins of this period still extant show that the Canton of the Arvernians had attained to extraordinary wealth and to a comparatively high standard of civilisation."

We must infer then that when the Romans were first brought into conflict with the Celts of Gaul under the same influences which have brought us into conflict with so many peoples in the Punjab and beyond the Himalayan range, they suddenly found themselves opposed to a highly civilised people. But the Celts were already exposed to the incursions of barbarous tribes who, in the long run, were to prove a more formidable enemy than Rome itself. Caesar declares that there were times when the Gauls were superior in value to the Germans. But there can be no doubt that, long before his own campaign, the migratory Teuton was pressing hard on the settled Celt. The conquest of the Celt in Southern Gaul was almost immediately succeeded by the great Teutonic invasion, which was decisively checked by Marius at Aix almost exactly a hundred years before the Christian era.

Thus, as the first century of the old era opened, the educated Roman had reason to become acquainted with the comparatively civilised Celts, who dwelt in Gaul, and the migratory and troublesome Teutons, to whom Marius had administered so severe a lesson. And, as the century wore on, this knowledge was largely increased. The appointment of Caesar to the government of Transalpine Gaul in B.C. 59 led to the brilliant campaign which made the whole of Transalpine Gaul and a fringe of Southern Britain a Roman province. Thenceforward the uncertainty which prevailed about the geography of Western Europe was ended. The advance of the Roman legions had made the whole of Gaul as familiar to the Romans as India is to the ordinary Englishman to-day. Before the first century of the new era was over Southern Britain acquired equal distinctness, and Agricola, by directing his fleet to sail round its shores, had proved for the first time what had previously been surmised,* that Britain was an island.

If the advance of the Roman eagles added to the geographical knowledge of the day, curiosity was almost simultaneously provoked by their decisive defeat. As the new era opened, indeed, there seemed every probability that Rome would repeat in Germany the conquest she had already made in Gaul. Tiberius actually advanced to the Elbe, and received the submission of many important tribes

* Bunbury's "History of Ancient Geography," Vol. II, p. 492.

which dwelt between that river and the Rhine. But the advance of Tiberius was followed by the crushing defeat of Varus, and though the younger Germanicus subsequently claimed that he had subdued all Germany west of the Elbe, the reverse was never repaired, and Germany was never included in the great Empire of Rome.

Yet cultivated Romans were naturally interested in a country where their arms had experienced so great a reverse: and Tacitus addressed himself to the excellent treatise on the manners of the Germans. But the Germania has greater value as an ethnographical and historical work than as a geographical essay. "He has given us little positive information of a geographical kind. He tells us nothing of the affluents of either [the Rhine or the Danube], nor does he notice even the names of the Ems or Weser, both of them so familiar to the Romans in the days of Augustus. Even the Elbe only obtains merely a passing mention in connection with its source. Nor do we find the name of the Vistula, which ever since the days of Agrippa had been regarded as the Eastern boundary of Germany on the side of Sarmatia." *

Defeat and retreat were limiting the knowledge, if they were exciting the curiosity of the Romans, and Germany remained unexplored like the still remoter unknown land which covered European Russia. North of Germany, no serious attempt had been made to explore the Northern Ocean. Drusus, the brother of Tiberius, had, indeed, sailed into these seas, but the terrors of the ocean had soon induced him to return. And even philosophic historians like Tacitus acquiesced in his decision. "Sanctius ac reverentius visum," so he could write, "de actis deorum credere quam scire." "It seems more reverent to believe in the works of God than to penetrate unknown oceans for the purpose of investigating them."

And so for nearly ten centuries a veil shut out from Western and Southern Europe the vast countries to the North of Germany which we now know as Denmark, Norway and Sweden. And while men like Drusus were hesitating to explore, and men like Tacitus were rejecting inquiry as inimical to faith, the Norsemen who had settled in these regions were training themselves and their descendants, by hardship on sea and land, for the career of conquest which was in store for them. The invasion of the Norsemen, however, brought home to everyone the existence of the countries from which these hardy freebooters came. It was no longer possible to ignore lands which had produced a race capable of conquering Britain and Normandy, of sweeping past the pillars of Hercules into the Mediterranean, of subduing Sicily, and of shaking the Emperor of the East on his throne at Constantinople. If, indeed, the art of printing had prevailed in those days, the growth of knowledge might have extended beyond a mere acquaintance with the Scandinavian

* Bunbury's "History of Ancient Geography," Vol. II., p. 495.

countries. For the same Norse race, which gave conquerors to Normandy, Britain and Sicily, produced men capable of crossing the Atlantic and of landing in the New World. The fame of this exploit was, however, completely forgotten: and no one realised that on the other side of the Atlantic was a great continent, the northern and southern half of which were both larger than the whole known world of the fourteenth century of our era.

Other discoveries were, indeed, to precede the addition of a New World to the known globe. In the thirteenth century Marco Polo set out from Italy for the Court of Kubla Khan, and, after a long residence in China, returned home to enrich the world with the knowledge which he had thus acquired. Nearly two centuries later Prince Henry the Navigator attempted to find a way by sea to the treasures of Arabia and the wealth of India. His example, before the end of the century, inspired even greater men than himself. In 1492 Columbus (to quote Mr. Lowell's happy phrase), seeking the back door of the Indies, found himself knocking at the front door of America. Other seamen soon followed in his track. And both North and South America were gradually added to the known world. While Columbus was opening out the West, Vasco da Gama was rounding the Cape of Good Hope, and affording a new route to the East. In fact all the additions which had been made to the world before sink in insignificance when compared with the discoveries which were effected in the close of the fifteenth and in the opening of the sixteenth centuries.

Before, indeed, the sixteenth century had expired something was known of every part of the habitable world except Australasia. The great Dutch atlas, which was published early in the seventeenth century, gives us with some approach to accuracy the outlines of all the four great continents and their dependent islands. The shape, indeed, of the great divisions of the earth's surface was not yet exactly determined. Their latitude and longitude were not always correctly given. But the student who had that elaborate atlas before him was at any rate able to obtain an approximate idea of the geography of the world. Except for the omission of Australasia, he had the broad facts before his eyes.

And the discovery of Australia was already imminent. In the middle of the seventeenth century two Dutchmen, Van Diemen and Tasman, both destined to imprint their name on the same island, demonstrated the existence of Australia, or New Holland, as it was at first called. But more than 100 years elapsed before the expedition of Captain Cook led to any accurate knowledge of the great Australasian territory, and it was only in the present century that the whole coastline of Australia was surveyed in a manner which made it possible to delineate it with accuracy on our maps.

In these great discoveries the seamen's work from its very nature

was only preliminary. Other explorers had to undertake the sometimes harder task of penetrating into the interior and ascertaining its condition and its resources. But the present century has been fruitful in producing such men. In America, in Asia, in Australia, they have done valuable work; while, in our own time, they have traversed and retraversed the Dark Continent of Africa, and added by doing so to the knowledge and to the extent of the world.

Into these later discoveries it is hardly our present object to enter. We have endeavoured to show how different the world of to-day is from the world of which we read in ancient history. The world of Homer was the world which surrounded the *Ægean*. The world of the Roman Consulate was the world which surrounded the Mediterranean. The flag of Empire has now moved from the *Ægean* to the Mediterranean, from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic. But while these vast additions have been made to the earth's surface, the world in another sense has become smaller. Steam and electricity have almost annihilated distance; and voyages, which would have had terrors for the boldest two centuries ago, are now undertaken by any pleasure-seeker who has time and money at his command. The Atlantic Ocean itself does not rouse the fears which the *Ægean* inspired in the breast of Homer; and the man who takes a ticket for a voyage round the world may be certain of accomplishing his purpose in less time than Jonah must have expected to occupy when he took his ticket, or at any rate paid his fare, on a vessel trading to Tarshish.

Geography has been sometimes called the handmaid of history; and no man, it is certain, can understand the history of any country without some knowledge of its geography. In the same way, however accurately we may know the History of Mankind, we shall have an inaccurate idea of it as a whole if we do not realise that the most important factor throughout has not been the struggle of Race, or Religion, or the Revolutions of Race and Religion, but what we have ventured to call "The Growth of the World."

SPENCER WALPOLE

BELGIAN OPINION ON THE CONGO QUESTION.

THE Belgian Chamber will shortly be called upon to give its decision as to the annexation of the Congo, a decision pressed for by England in order that Belgium may put an end to the abuses which have aroused English public opinion against the Government of King Leopold's African colony. This is the first time since Belgium obtained her independence that any vote of her Parliament has had international importance or interested foreign opinion. It may, therefore, be useful to endeavour to consider under what conditions and in what spirit the decision will be arrived at. The political circumstances of Belgium are simple enough and are very well known; but the question is so novel and so full of difficulties, and comes before the nation in circumstances so abnormal, that outside observers may very likely be deceived as to the state of public opinion in Belgium, and it is worth while, for their sakes, to examine the subject somewhat closely, in order to remove misunderstanding, and show things as they really are.

The British Government, yielding to an intense movement of public opinion, invites Belgium to take over the Congo in order to effect the necessary reforms. It believes itself to be also handling judiciously Belgian susceptibilities; but in this it is mistaken. Its action in the matter, coupled with the ringing speeches of ministers in the House of Commons and elsewhere, has wounded these susceptibilities, and has given an opportunity for that portion of the Belgian press which is systematically devoted to the Congo State to represent England as seeking to pick a quarrel with King Leopold, not in order to obtain reforms for the benefit of the natives and the commercial freedom guaranteed by the Act of Berlin, but in order to possess herself of the Congo, or at least

to partition it and secure for herself a share which would enable her to carry through the Cape to Cairo railway on British soil. The defenders of the African policy of the King have reminded the Belgians of the Transvaal business, and have tried in every way to excite among the Belgians feelings of distrust and hostility towards England. Belgians in general have nothing but sympathy for England, all the more because they know that she is the natural protector of their neutrality, and that her foreign policy has no other objects than peace and free trade, which are the basis of their own prosperity. They recognise also in England the model for Parliamentary countries, and, although they have not the same continual and intimate relations with their insular neighbours that they have with the French, Belgian Liberals entertain lively feelings of sympathy with English Liberals. When Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman came into power, the Liberal Left deputies in the Belgian Chamber sent him an address of congratulation. But the intervention of England in the affairs of the Congo has undoubtedly been looked upon by most Belgians with great distrust and no little resentment. They have looked at it in the very light in which the British Government did not want them to look at it, as an unfriendly interference in the domestic affairs of Belgium. On all sides it has been reiterated that such interference could not be tolerated, and that Congo affairs were a matter for Belgians, a matter to be dealt with by Belgians amongst themselves, independently of all foreign intervention. The bulk of the Belgian press systematically defends the views of the Congo State—that is to say, the views of the King—or else contents itself with inserting the *communiqués* of the Press Bureau. That Bureau was established by the Congo State, and has been justly denounced in the Belgian Chamber as an agency for corruption and for the poisoning of the public mind. It has taken advantage of the complaints from England to organise a regular campaign against Britain, and to represent that the protests of English opinion against the Congo abuses are nothing but the interested libels of the “Merchants of Liverpool.” They meet everything with this stereotyped reply, and when Belgians, from a sense of humanity and national honour, join in denouncing the abuses, their fellow countrymen remain sceptical, or even reproach them as dupes, if not accomplices, of the merchants of Liverpool. It is just possible that the mere fact of writing this article may bring down this reproach on my head. Only yesterday, M. Hennebieg, one of the chief apologists for the King’s policy, wrote to a Brussels paper as follows :—“Together with the fate of “one of the richest colonies in the world, our own independence “and future are at stake. Among the Powers who signed the

"Act of Berlin, England, in spite of whom this international enterprise was undertaken, is pursuing a policy destructive of the whole of the work started in 1884, and of that which represents it, the Congo State. Germany opposes this, and defends the work. We, who are the stake in this conflict, are caught and carried along in this strife of nations." And a great number of the defenders of the King's Congo policy say under their breath what M. Hennebieg proclaims from the house-top: Belgium must treat England as an enemy, and work along with Germany against her. The formidable fortifications constructed at Antwerp may, at need, serve as a threat to England, instead of as a foothold for an English army coming to maintain the neutrality of Belgium.

The exaggeration of these wild remarks is obvious. But it is none the less a very serious matter that they should have been uttered, and such a state of things could only have been brought about by the profound ignorance and, consequently, as I will explain, the extraordinary indifference which characterises Belgian public opinion in all that concerns the affairs of the Congo. The Belgian public knows nothing about the Congo. And everything has been done to secure that it should be so. But it is very extraordinary that when the report of the Commission of Inquiry, sent to the Congo by the King as a result of English protests, confirmed by official declarations the reality of the abuses which had been denounced in England, and of the unrestrained exploitation of native labour which had been the fatal cause of these abuses, the report seemed to pass without notice in Belgium, and its statements produced only very mild emotion. The truth is that the mass of the Belgian public take no interest whatever in colonial affairs. They have never been in the habit of doing so, and have always considered the Congo enterprise as a private business of the King's, which had nothing to do with Belgium. It was indeed under these conditions that the King was authorised by the Belgian Chamber in 1885 to become sovereign of the Congo. M. Beernaert, at that time head of the Government, took care to make a solemn declaration that the Congo should be to Belgium an entirely foreign State, and that Belgium should never be involved in its affairs, either diplomatic, military or financial. Since then the King has been allowed to requisition a large number of Belgian officers in order to turn them into agents for the Congo State, to employ in the service of the Congo a great many Belgian public servants and diplomatists, and at various times to solicit on behalf of the Independent State the financial intervention of Belgium. And he has not been interfered with. But when the question arose in 1895 of uniting the fortunes of Belgium with those of the Congo by annexation, a scheme

put forward by the Government of M. de Burlet in order to extricate the Congo State from the financial embarrassment which it had got into owing to the Arab war, there was such an outcry of public opinion that the Government had to withdraw the project.

It was then that the Congo State, obliged to meet its expenses out of its own resources, began the system of conceding commercial monopolies and the practice of excessive exploitation of native labour. This resulted in splendid commercial profits for the King and his associates, the extent and suddenness of which drew a considerable number of partisans to the side of the Congo policy, especially in Antwerp and Brussels. The Belgians, who are above all men of business, began to say to one another that there was perhaps money to be made in the Congo, but there were very few who stopped to consider by what means the money had been made, and whether a civilised State could for any length of time make use of such means. But to the mind of the King, the chief result of this prosperity of the Congo revenues was to give him a keen desire to keep in his own hands the uncontrolled administration of a business which appeared to be prospering, and he thenceforth abandoned the idea of annexing the Congo to Belgium, which would have put an end to his free disposal of the resources of the State—a State of which he was, according to M. Beernaert's expression, "as absolute a sovereign as Louis XIV. was of France." At the same time a certain number of political men who were in a better position than the mass of the public to acquaint themselves with what was going on in the Congo, and also men of business whose interests had been hurt by the exactions of the monopolies, came to the conclusion that the only means of putting an end to the extravagances resulting from the colonial autocracy of the King was to annex the Congo to Belgium. Belgium had a right to annex in 1901, in virtue of a convention passed in 1890 by M. Beernaert with the Independent State. When M. Beernaert, in 1901, proposed to exercise this right, the King indignantly protested, and wrote to M. Woeste, a personal enemy of M. Beernaert and his rival in the leadership of the Catholic party, that "the worst enemies of the Congo were those who sought immediate annexation." The matter was therefore let alone, and the Government of M. de Smet de Naeyer, in order to gain time, declared that before taking over the Congo it would be necessary to pass colonial legislation, and then to arrange the details of the annexation. He proceeded to draw up a Colonial Bill which he must have known was absolutely unacceptable, since it comprised pure and simple consecration after annexation of the existing absolutism of the King in the Congo. The Government, however, had only put this forward as a matter of form, and took no pains to bring on its

discussion in the Chamber. The Parliamentary Commission charged to examine into it took five years to get constituted and hold one sitting. This was significant enough. In the meantime the exploitation of negro labour yielded more and more brilliant results ; but the protests in England became more and more bitter ; and as they finally culminated in a demand on the part of England that the Congo should be annexed to Belgium, it became necessary, whilst proclaiming no surrender to English injunctions, to work a little more seriously at the annexation question, or at least to appear to work at it. The Parliamentary Commission met, examined the Colonial Bill, made a few alterations on minor points, but preserved the absolutism, deciding that the King should have full executive and legislative power in the Congo after the annexation as before, and that he alone should regulate the budget and the accounts without interference from Parliament. As for the rights of the natives, whose existence was not even mentioned in the original Bill, the Commission clearly showed with what ignorance this question is approached in Belgium. M. Beernaert had proposed to borrow from the Dutch colonial law a series of declarations recognising the elementary rights of man for the natives. The Commission rejected them as a whole, without condescending to examine into them, and satisfied themselves with the adoption of a proposition that there must be a Commission in the Congo appointed by the King, whose duty it would be to watch over native interests—a Commission, indeed, which has been in existence ten years, and has been of no use at all. I do not even know whether it has met more than once. The Belgians, to this day, know nothing, and refuse to know anything about the ill-treatment of the natives on the Congo. For this reason the English Government seems to be a prey to a singular delusion, when it expects that an annexation forced on Belgium will lead to the amelioration of the lot of the natives and to reforms which it has not been able to obtain from the Congo State.

The Belgians do not believe in the abuses pointed out by England. They are ignorant of them. How can they be expected to interest themselves keenly in their suppression ? They have not even been told that the annexation of the Congo has only been proposed because the English Government demanded it. It would be to admit that they were giving way before an English demand, and the tactics of the partisans of the King's policy seem to be to hold themselves in reserve in order, eventually, to rouse Belgian susceptibilities against the second English demand, from which the attention of the Belgian public has also been carefully diverted : England demands that Belgium shall annex the Congo, in order that Belgium may carry out the reforms in the Congo which the Indepen-

dent State has not been willing to effect. Now these reforms will be costly, and the Belgians, who will have to pay, have not been warned by anyone hitherto that, far from bringing them in treasure, the Congo, if they wish to avoid a conflict with England, is at first going to cost them 15 or 20 millions of francs a year. In fact, the Congo budget amounts at present to 37 millions of francs, 27 of which are produced directly or indirectly by forced labour. And again, the greater part of the revenue goes to military expenses. Everything still remains to be done on the Congo. M. de Smet de Naeyer (possibly, indeed, with the object of disgusting the Belgians with the annexation which he proposed, but of which he knew the King was no partisan) said one day in the Chamber, that to equip the Congo would require the expenditure of hundreds of millions, perhaps a milliard of francs. Forced labour once suppressed, where is it to be found? If, after the annexation, the King remains absolute sovereign of the Congo, as the Government proposes, and if the Congolese and Belgian finances are kept strictly separate, quite independently of his own preferences and of the traditions of Congo administration the necessities of the budget will require the least possible change in the present system. And if the Belgian Parliament considered itself called upon to take over the effective control of the colony, things would hardly be any better from the point of view of reform, since the reforms would cost money to Belgium. The Belgian Parliament is, in fact, elected by tax-paying Belgians. Its members will naturally be much more anxious about the sentiments of the electors than about the happiness of the negroes and the moral obligations of colonial policy; and the electors will be far more anxious to keep down their taxes than to ameliorate the lot of the blacks in Central Africa, more especially as the Belgian electors were never consulted as to whether it suited them to have an empire in Africa, or even any colonial policy at all.

No one in Belgium had ever thought of straying into the paths of colonial policy, and if the King had not personally taken the initiative, such policy would have found no supporters. Belgium, without colonies, has attained an unheard-of degree of material prosperity. Compared with her territory and her population, her industrial and commercial activity is three times that of England; and even from the point of view of the actual figures of commercial exchanges she is only surpassed by England, the United States, and Germany, and barely by France. The total amount of the foreign trade of Belgium last year was ten milliards of francs, of which the trade with the Congo forms only a very low, almost ridiculously small, proportion, something like 70 millions, 60 of which are for rubber. Under these circumstances many Belgians consider

a colonial policy absolutely useless and superfluous. Others reckon that one is never too rich, and that the Congo is so big that there must be money to be made there, and, since it is offered us, it is just as well to accept it. It is probable that if the question of eventual cost were clearly put before them they would hesitate considerably. Others, and, as I have said, especially political men, who, from feelings of thorough loyalty, decline to discuss the abuses committed in the Congo and believe that they have been exaggerated, but who yet know that abuses have been committed, and that they might lead to a conflict between Belgium and England, wish for annexation in order to put an end to these evils and to restrain the autocracy of the King. But the great mass of the public, so far from sharing either of these opinions, have no opinion at all, either as to the Congo or as to colonial policy in general. The question has never been put before the electors at any general election; no deputy has referred to the Congo on the platform, nor to colonial politics at all. The result has been notably that the present Chamber is absolutely without a mandate on the question of the annexation, and as half the senators and deputies must stand for re-election in the month of May next, it is a very natural request to make, in a country the Government of which is strictly parliamentary, that the question should not be settled without having been submitted to the nation by a dissolution. Perhaps in that case those who have opinions on colonial policy and on the question of the Congo, and those particularly who objected to the abuses of the Congo administration before there were any protests in England, will be able to create a public opinion amongst the Belgians and induce them to charge those they elect to Parliament with the duty of making it effective. One only of the three Belgian political parties has been so far called upon to pronounce an opinion on the Congo question, and that is the Socialist party, which counts for no more than one-sixth of the votes in the Chamber. In spite of the efforts of its leader, M. Vandervelde, in favour of annexation, it has pronounced against taking over the Congo. England would be wrong, therefore, in thinking that there is any movement in Belgium for the reform of the Congo abuses, or any serious interest in colonial affairs amongst the larger public, or that the annexation of the Congo by Belgium, even under normal conditions, must result in bringing about reform.

The only thing which is beginning to interest and move the Belgians on this Congo question is the internal political problem which it presents for Belgium, from the point of view of the working of the constitution and the reciprocal rights of King and Parliament. It is on this point that the whole struggle bears. And again, the most essential point of the problem, that of the danger which

threatens the successful working of Parliamentary government in Belgium by investing the King with absolute and uncontrolled power in colonial affairs, has been much less an object of public attention than the question as to the conditions which the King will impose on the annexation, which are in contradiction to the right of annexation pure and simple accorded to Belgium by the convention of 1890, and to the will of the Chamber clearly and unanimously declared in an order of the day of the 14th December, 1906, to annex the Congo only on condition that Belgium shall exercise plenary powers of sovereignty there. Now the annexation treaty which has been agreed upon between the King and the Belgian ministry preserves as an inviolable contract the *Fondation de la Couronne* to which the King has assigned the possession of one-seventh of the Congo territory ; its revenue was more than 6 million francs in 1906, and it is calculated to amount in time to more than 20 millions. The revenue is to be administered according to instructions which are to be kept secret by a committee of six persons nominated by the King, whose places are to be filled, after his death, half by co-optation, half by Royal appointment. "the successor to the King on the Belgian throne being considered entirely as representing the founder," that is to say, without being subject to the councils of his ministers. This revenue is to be employed according to the instructions of the founder for objects which mostly relate to the departments of the State, the creation of a navy, of colonial and other schools, of works of public health, and education, subsidies to the Catholic missions in Africa, and, above all, works for city embellishments in Belgium, which have already been begun at Brussels, Laeken, and Ostend. The absolutely sumptuous and at times very extravagant style of these erections has caught the attention of everyone. They are to be carried out to the extent of hundreds of millions of francs, according to vast plans which exist but which the King alone knows. People have every right to say, as they do, that such an institution, which is absolutely contrary to Belgian law (that is not disputed), must in effect limit Belgian sovereignty in Africa, and would constitute in Belgium a State within the State. It would, in addition, give over to the Royal power, which is strictly limited by the Belgian constitution, a means of action and of influence quite incompatible with the proper government of the people by the people. On this point there is a body of public opinion in Belgium, and it is distinctly hostile to the treaty of annexation. It is pretty certain that the treaty will not pass in the form in which it has been presented, and that fresh negotiations will have to be undertaken. It has even been suggested that the result was foreseen and desired beforehand in order to drag the matter

on as long as possible, and to gain one more year. But it is to be feared that the struggle will be concentrated on the question of the unacceptable conditions attached by the King to the annexation and of their consequences to the internal politics of Belgium, and that other still more important questions, such as the necessary reforms in the Congo, the rights of the natives, and the opportunity for a colonial policy, will be lost sight of and decided according to chance circumstances, and that the country will not be called upon to pronounce and say whether or no she will assume the responsibilities devolving upon Belgium with the annexation of the Congo.

GEORGES LORAND.

THE LIMITS OF DIRECT TAXATION.

WHEN, of the contribution required by the State, the sum levied immediately upon the private fortune of the citizen exceeds a certain small proportionate amount, the wheels of the whole fiscal system begin to run out of truth; there is apparent a friction whose effects rise much more rapidly than the levy seems to warrant, and long before the burden is, in theory, heavy, the whole machinery of direct taxation has ceased to work.

This phenomenon has marked the summit of one civilisation after another. The State first demanded (among its other fiscal demands) a certain amount to be paid directly by its citizens out of their net revenues to the agents of the Treasury. The demand was easily met. Time passed. The State grew more complex and more active; coincidently the demand slightly rose; from a twentieth, perhaps, it became a fifteenth; or even from a fifteenth a tenth; but long before the channels of supply should in theory have become clogged, and long before the direct tax should have roused an intolerable sense of oppression, the State has found itself compelled to have recourse to methods less direct, and even though it maintained direct taxation unincreased, the mere development of society so wrought upon the old methods of that direct taxation as to bring the fiscal system of one great country after another to a standstill.

We are at the present moment in modern England arrived at the limit of direct taxation; by which statement I do not mean that our revenue from our present sources of direct taxation will not continue to expand somewhat, nor that it will not be possible to discover certain new sources (though they be exiguous) from which further direct taxation may be drawn, but I mean that direct taxation has ceased to yield the increase which, according to its superficial aspect, it should yield. I mean that the country has an apparent difficulty in paying directly quite small percentages upon the apparent total income of its citizens; and I mean, above all, that for the large social experiments of the future direct taxation will prove completely inadequate.

Why is this? Direct taxation, as I shall presently show, is, in appearance, the most just, the most immediate, the most simple and therefore the most easily calculated for all purposes of imposition and of relief. Yet it undoubtedly fails after a certain point (and that point is reached early in its growth) to fulfil its apparent function. Why, is this?

Before attempting the answer to this question, I would present in a few words the patent and strong arguments in favour of direct taxation as the sole, or at any rate the main, source of national revenue.

A tax is a portion of private wealth seized by the public power for public uses under the sanction of public force.

It is self-evident that many another social system might be imagined than that under which we live. We might imagine a public power possessed of a public fortune; that is, a public power endowed with the means of production to such an extent as to make it partly or entirely independent of levying contributions upon private citizens. Such was the idea of the eleventh, twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. We might imagine a State in which all means of production whatsoever were in the hands of the State itself, so that there should be no private contribution to tax, but that the minutest details of affection and comedy should be in the hands of a weary bureaucracy. Such is the ideal of many Jews, of numerous northern Germans, of not a few anæmic men in this country, and of intellectuals in general to whom such speculations are entertaining.

We might, I say, imagine many a State in which taxation so defined should not exist; but in any State where taxation does exist, this is the definition of it: a portion of private wealth seized by the public power for public uses under the sanction of public force.

Now the argument that such a sequestration should be simple, immediate, and direct is very strong.

The regular needs of the State being once determined, the portion to be so withdrawn commonly bears a general relation to the sum of private fortunes; the State knows what fraction it must regularly demand. Conversely, that which each citizen is prepared to forego regularly will commonly bear a general relation to his means; the individual knows how much he can or will pay. One may therefore lay down the general principle that *regular* taxation appears both to the State and to the citizen as a measurable fraction or percentage cut off from the sum of private incomes, and, indeed, regular taxation is usually expressed in such terms. Thus a statesman defending a new tax will say: "After all, it is but 'such and such a fraction of the national income.'" Or, again, a private citizen, estimating the burden he bears, will take it as a

fraction of his total income, saying: "Altogether I pay quite such " and such a number of shillings in the pound." The very terminology of taxation, whether that taxation be freely voted or arbitrarily imposed, follows this conception of a regular percentage upon private resources. Thus the parliaments in the Middle Ages (when the arbitrary imposition of taxation would have been regarded with horror, and when a free man's contribution was thought of as a gift) spoke of "tenths" and "fifteenths." Even to-day a modern Government imposing a tax, with a power almost absolute, estimates it in terms of income general or particular.

The obvious method, then, for levying regular and annual taxation, seems to be (so long as private property endures) to demand from each citizen a certain proportion of the annual income he enjoys. To determine that income and to demand a fixed proportion of it is to levy direct taxation, and this process of direct taxation is the process which all States have employed when they had no experience of other and less straightforward means. It is a process which most reformers, in their quest after simplicity and justice, have demanded when an inheritance of other methods, as for instance, of old and tangled customary dues, had grown to disturb the equilibrium of society.

At first sight no more just or logical process could be conceived. Direct taxation is a process exactly consonant with the general nature and purpose of all taxation. The burden imposed can be directly increased upon occasions of necessity, or directly remitted. It can be drawn to an accurate scale of sacrifice. It can be lifted in particular cases of special hardship, or added to in particular cases of special opportunity. It is flexible. It is accessible to constant revision. It is open to the inspection and criticism of the public conscience. It neither favours nor discriminates against any one trade or profession.

Now the most important by far of these advantages is the fact that *the sacrifice involved can apparently be accurately measured*, and this is the capital argument in favour of direct taxation; for, apparently, where direct taxation is used, the fullest measure of justice can be achieved. Does the State directly demand of a citizen, and directly obtain from him five per cent. of his income? Then surely we know that of every pound the citizen might have spent, one shilling has been taken and but nineteen remain. Surely we can accurately estimate the amount of the sacrifice! Is it ten per cent.? We all know what proportionate loss each of us feels when, of a pound to spend, a florin is lost or required for some purpose other than his own. And so forth; nothing could, apparently, be more lucid or more equitable.

It is at this point that there enters the paradox which the high complexity of human affairs is for ever raising to the confusion of simple and apparently perfect schemes.

This lucid, equitable and obvious process of direct taxation is invariably found to be tainted with a certain element of confusion and oppression.

All history proves—and to-day much of our contemporary experience as well—that the admirable characters which should theoretically attach to direct taxation under all circumstances do, as a fact, attach to it only when such taxation is very low or when the social conditions under which it is levied are very simple. As the percentage so levied rises, the burden imposed grows out of all proportion to the fraction demanded; and as the activity and multiplicity of the State develop, a given fixed percentage tends to inflict a greater and a greater sacrifice, until at last direct taxation breaks down. Time and again a State has found the limits of direct taxation to be reached though the percentage demanded was small, and though the activity of the State was high and its economic conditions flourishing. For instance, it will be universally admitted to-day, in spite of the criticism or rather the sneers of those who have imperfectly studied the problem, that an Income-tax of a shilling in the pound, even though it is levied upon the incomes of but a tenth of the community, is very high, while one of eighteenpence would be barely endurable, and one of two shillings would certainly be largely evaded or even refused; yet this “high” tax is but five per cent. apparently of actual revenue; this “unendurable” one” but seven-and-a-half per cent.; and that last, which could not be collected, is (again, apparently) but ten per cent. of the whole.

I am not talking of taxes avowedly confiscatory, I am talking of taxes in a free State, where the means of production in the hands of certain citizens are destined to remain in those hands, and where the amount demanded is demanded out of revenue and not out of capital. Why should such comparatively slight charges as five per cent, seven-and-a-half, or even ten, be of such moment? Why should the limit to the yield of direct taxation arrive so soon in the scale of its increase?

An attempt to answer these questions is the purpose of what follows; and when such an answer is arrived at I think it will be found that (apart from certain minor accidents) three main titles will account for the imperfection of this form of revenue and for the rapid exhaustion of its productivity. These three titles are: First, the *state of mind of the payer of the tax*; secondly, the *necessary inequality of assessment*; and thirdly, that *exaggeration of the basis of taxation* to which direct taxation leads.

With the first of these points, the psychology of the payer, economic science is familiar; it will need but a brief mention. The

second, the inequality of assessment, has been considered frequently, though not exhaustively, by several authorities. The third, the exaggeration of the basis of taxation, is far the most important of the three, because it accounts for the difficulties peculiar to a high condition of economic activity, such as is that of modern England, and because it has not yet suffered analysis. To this new point, therefore, I shall devote the most of my space, and I hope to show, in connection with this new point, how direct taxation tends to levy a larger proportion of real wealth than it professes to levy, and how this extra proportion increases rapidly with the activity, complexity and development of a community.

The first step in the enquiry is to define direct as against indirect taxation.

Like all categories of things done and experienced by men, these two categories have vague boundaries; nevertheless it is possible and even easy to establish a principle of differentiation between them, which is this, that indirect taxation concerns itself immediately with things, the objects possessed; while direct taxation concerns itself immediately with the persons possessing. In the indirect form of taxation the State says: "Such and such an article would have cost you so much had I not interfered. I will demand a payment from him who manufactures or transports it, relative to it alone; and thus I will increase its price to the consumer by a sum which shall form part of my revenue." Or, again: "I will make it myself and charge my own price." In the direct form of taxation the State approaches the individual owner of enjoyable things and says: "You shall sacrifice to me such and such a proportion of your total power of economic consumption, no matter to what objects you might be intending to direct that power of consumption." A sophist could quarrel with this definition indefinitely. He could show how the importer, having paid duty upon an article, might quixotically determine not to sell it to any consumer, in which case he would undoubtedly himself be paying a direct tax. Nay, a sophist might set out to prove, as have not a few sophists in the past, that all taxes were ultimately direct taxes. Conversely it might be argued that the most direct of taxes could be passed on; that a man might say: "As I have to pay so much Income-tax, I can only afford so much for my rent," etc. And by this process a chain of argument could be raised to prove (as some sophists have pretended to prove) that all taxation ultimately falls upon land values.

But arguments of either kind, though common enough in economic debate, may be neglected. They have no relation to the real motives or conduct of men, and may therefore be eliminated from whatever examination of an economic problem professes to be fruitful. The main distinction stands. Direct taxation is taxation which concerns

itself with individual power of enjoyment and taxes that; indirect taxation is taxation which concerns itself with the thing produced or in transport, raising its cost to the consumer before it reaches him, and, so to speak, without his knowledge.

Where an *object*, not a person, is taxed, a concrete portion can be segregated—as was the case with the old tithes; and even if (as is the case to-day) a money-tax be taken the business is simple enough. A certain definite and measurable amount of beer is made in such and such a brewery, a certain definite and measurable amount of tobacco or tea is imported at such and such a port; upon a rough knowledge of what the tea, tobacco or beer is likely to cost during the fiscal year the Excise or the Customs can fix their proportion of payment.

But where direct taxation is concerned, no simple estimate of actually existing wealth can be made; it is necessary to form an "assessment," and this assessment is not an estimate of material and measurable goods, it is an estimate of an abstraction, namely, a man's total power of general consumption in the course of the year. To put the matter in accurate terms. An assessment is *an estimate of the total effective demand of an individual in the course of the fiscal year*. It is an estimate of that control over the consumption of wealth which existing arrangements have endowed him with. It is not an estimate of his total productive power; for he may be granted by legal process much less than or much more than his power to produce. Of that which the Egyptians produce (for instance) a considerable portion goes to swell the effective demand of certain money-lenders, for whom we act as interest gatherers, and who never in their lives produced one useful thing. Conversely our own governing class is a congeries of men, whose effective demand is high while their power to produce is low.

What the State does when it imposes direct taxation is to ascertain by an assessment not a man's producing power, nor even the material objects he can show, but the abstract *effective demand* which he can exercise for the production and consumption of values. A man's "income" is but his power under existing laws to exercise such and such an amount of general demand for commodities. The State having estimated that demand, proceeds next to levy by force an instrument from him, whereby a proportion of that effective demand is transferred to the State.

Citizen A meant to spend one per cent. of his income upon coals. That is to say the legal arrangements of the community were such that Citizen A, having the right, protected by courts of law and by the physical power at the disposal of the Government, to compel a hundred units of wealth (the results of a hundred units of energy applied to a hundred units of capital and a hundred of natural resources) to approach him for consumption, intended one out of that hundred units to constitute a demand for a proportionate amount

of coal miners' energy to be applied through the capital of the coal mining company to a certain coal mine. As a result of this concentration of his demand, ten tons of the coal (let us say) were to be brought to his door in Westminster. The Government forced him to give them an instrument (a cheque or a portion of the current medium, or what not) whereby he transferred that power to them. The Government get that coal, not he; the Government armed with this instrument cause the miners to use the capital of the mining company, and by that use to get the coal out of the ground and to transfer it, not to Citizen A's own comfortable residence in Great College Street, but to the Government's far less comfortable apartments next door at the Ecclesiastical Commissioners'.

That is the machinery and the theory of direct taxation; and it would seem to follow that under a system of direct taxation the commodities at the disposal of the community are shorn of just that fraction demanded by Government, and that this fraction alone is removed from the enjoyment of private citizens and put at the disposal of the Government. With a ten per cent. tax, for instance, one ton of coal would go in every ten, one pound of tea in every ten, and so forth. Unfortunately the thing in practice is not quite so simple; the amount that goes is more than one ton or one pound in ten—and tends to be *much* more. First, because men do not regard their expenses, nor can they regard their expenses, as completely elastic; secondly, because the assessment of the effective demand of each citizen is necessarily grossly imperfect; and thirdly (the most important point), *because even were all assessments rigidly just and accurate in individual cases, the sum of those individual assessments would not equal but would greatly exceed the actual wealth of the community.* In other words the three causes of disturbance already noted: the psychology of the payer of the tax, the inequality of assessment, and the exaggeration of the basis of taxation, vitiate all the calculations of direct taxation, and vitiate them more and more in proportion as the State is more highly developed.

Let me deal briefly with the first two points.

First, the psychology of the payer. The difficulty which direct taxation meets with in this connection is two-fold. It lies first in the uncritical attitude of the mind towards quantity and duration when it is considering a sacrifice, and secondly in the uncritical attitude of the mind when it is estimating regular and repeated expenditure in a particular condition of society.

The attitude of the mind towards the quantity and duration of sacrifice is necessarily false. The mind of a man of moderate income does not regard a penny as the two-hundred-and-fortieth part of a pound. He regards the pound as an important sum, the penny as unimportant or infinitesimal. A labourer at twenty shillings a week does not regard a thousand pounds as twenty years of income, he

regards it as a sum infinitely large. Again, men's conception of the relation of various sums of money is determined by the nature of the expenditure to be made, the place and the time. The same man who would think it extravagant to buy a horse, though he would like one, will spend more than the value and keep of a horse in going daily first class instead of third to his business. You may see a man spending whole minutes in getting a telegram within the sixpence, while his taximeter outside is eating many times over the ha'penny he has saved. So much for quantity.

It is the same thing with duration. The mind cannot appreciate a day as the 365th part of three succeeding years and the 366th part of a fourth. It has no senses whereby to appreciate these mechanical minute divisions. There are but general gradations in its appreciation of duration as of quantity; the mind of man is the organic mind of an artist and a creator, it is not a machine of calculation and of record. There is a criticism of this quality or defect in the mind common in the mouths of stunted men. They call it unreasonable. It could only be unreasonable in a being of infinite perceptions, and immortal. The same economist who ridicules a man for wasting pennies day by day and complaining of the loss of pounds at the end of the year, will himself build an expensive house upon some other man's land, though in a fixed term it ceases to be his property, and will then complain of the falling in of the lease. The paradox that a man will spend in small daily amounts treble that which he would pay in one large amount at the end of a lengthy period, is so native and so permanent a part of human motive that upon a recognition of it and a slow, dirty calculation of it, all usury is based.

Now, though it is admittedly odious that the usurer should play upon this limitation in his fellow-men, yet it is wise and just that the State should consider it in its imposition of a tax, if only because the neglect of it will leave the State with insufficient revenue. Ask a man for sixpence a day indirectly, levied upon his ordinary expenditure, and you will receive it. Ask him for a ten-pound note once a year in a lump sum, and it is possible enough that he will not have it; it is still more possible that you will not receive it. There are twenty good reasons for this which it would be tedious to enumerate. As for instance, that you will only receive it from the man who saves (the other man simply has not got it); that when he pays the money indirectly for a thing, he is exercising his own will, whereas when he is paying you the lump sum at the end of the year, he is not exercising his own will but yours—and so forth. But of all the reasons for the ease whereby indirect taxation may be levied (as compared with direct), by far the strongest and the most obvious is this: That to increase indirect taxation upon an article is to increase but one small province of general expenditure; to increase direct taxation upon the demand note for the year, is to increase expenditure in one

particular large and galling province of expenditure. It is to increase it upon a category of expenditure which is for all immediate purposes quite unproductive of enjoyment, which has to every man the aspect of a fine or loss, and which is, for such as pay direct taxes, large in proportion to any other one direct category of public payment. Put a penny on tea, a ha'penny on sugar, a penny on a bottle of wine, twopence on a cigar, and so forth with twenty articles, and those classes which pay direct taxation are paying far less upon any one category than they would be paying were you to put the whole equivalent amount upon the Income-tax, and when they pay on cigars or wine they associate the payment with a tangible good: it is not a mere loss of cash to them as paying a direct tax is.

It is further true that a man calculates his expenditure (especially in an old and stable society) upon a regular scale; and he regards taxation as a proportion taken from that domestic budget of his. A man cannot (in an old and stable society) suddenly give up one house and go and live in a cheaper one, or suddenly reduce his daily habits, forego the society of certain friends, the use of certain elements of his life, and then pick them up again at will. Go, for instance, to the English middle-class to-day, and tell them the grave news that in future two shillings out of every pound they earn will be taken by the State, and it is conceivable that such a revolution would effect a transformation of their lives; they might perhaps do without carpets, or without the things called d'oyleys, or without top hats, or without the use of a kind of black cloth which gets dirty more easily than any other, or even (but this is an extreme supposition) without the use of starched linen. But what you cannot do is *gradually* to raise beyond a certain limit the direct taxation for which a man has allowed in his calculation of yearly expenditure. If you do so you soon come up against the stone wall of custom. Society does not consist, in an old and stable community, of an inclined plane; it consists of a series of steps, and some of these steps are very deep indeed. Long before a man would consent to descend one of them and to condemn himself and his heirs to the lower level, he would employ every subterfuge and every evasion.

These two points then—the psychology of repeated small payments as against one large payment, and the psychology of class and habit in an old society—are the main points which set a limit to direct taxation so far as the state of mind of the payer of the taxes is concerned. I repeat, they have often been dealt with in the past, and need no more than this passing allusion.

With the inequality of assessment it is otherwise. Here, you have a definite and a measurable economic problem, and I propose, however briefly, to recapitulate certain elements of it:—

(A) *Leakage*—The practical impossibility of arriving at actual effective demand in every case, and the probability that you will

not come to an exact estimate in most cases. Every Chancellor of the Exchequer and every tax collector knows this. The opportunities for evasion are innumerable; but this is particularly to be remarked, that such incomes as are permanent, regular, and, as it were, publicly ascertainable, necessarily pay for the evasion of the rest. Now the more society develops, the more new discoveries arise, and the more the investment of capital tends to be speculative, the more does that type of income produced by success in these speculations preponderate among the large incomes of the community. Conversely, that sort of man who is content with a regular life, and who is, if anything, bewildered by the opportunities of his time, becomes more and more subject to the grasp of the State. The old landed gentleman whose acres can be ascertained; the man of a fixed income in consols or debentures, whose income can be taxed at its source; the myriads of men with "berths," clerks, managers and the rest, are all ready to be shorn; the man who has bought oil at 66, and sold it at 75, or who has "floated" a new chemical dye, is not so easily tracked down. If anyone doubts that in the practical and concrete instance of the Income Tax in modern England the small man suffers for the large, let him try this experiment. Let him obtain, or rather demand, a return of the Income Tax paid by such and such a great speculator during the twenty years before his death, and contrast the sums mentioned in such a return with that which the Exchequer finally dealt with in the Succession Duties.

(B) *Gradation*.—As it is evident that some distinction must be made in all direct taxation between those who can pay with difficulty and those who can pay with ease, there must be and always has been gradation. But that gradation involves innumerable inequalities and consequent evasions. And note that here again it is the large, uncertain income, characteristic of a highly developed and complex commercial civilisation, which in the main escapes. You have to put a superior limit. We do in practice in the present Budget put it at two thousand a year. Contrast what is meant by one shilling in the pound to a man with two thousand a year living on a country estate and with nothing but a fixed income paid by trustees, maintaining numerous dependents and in some sort responsible for the whole parish, with a similar percentage levied upon some nomad, levantine fellow, a bird of passage in these Islands, who by the buying and selling of speculative stock, or by some common form of usury, nets ten times that amount. Even supposing the latter could be made to pay his shilling in the pound, what sacrifice would be involved in the payment?

Here, again, it is the inferior limit which sets the pace. You cannot make the smaller man pay more; the limit of direct taxation is reached with him; therefore it is equally reached with that other man whom we should all be delighted to fleece until he shivered in the wind, and because you can't in decency ask the squire for more

than a hundred odd pounds you are debafed from asking Park Lane for more than a thousand.

(C) *The difficulty of distinguishing between earned and unearned incomes.*—It is a plainly evident principle that a distinction must be made between earned and unearned incomes if a proportionate sacrifice is to be required; yet so difficult is it to make this distinction that in England, in spite of the most powerful advocates, we have waited for over a century for this reform; and now that it has arrived, the new remedy, with its necessarily inquisitorial method, seems almost worse than the old disease. There are innumerable complications, moreover, in the application of the principle; as—to define “earning,” to decide when earnings are so large as to merit full taxation, or so small as to escape altogether; to distinguish between the earnings which are highly precarious and those which are permanent (and in some cases even carrying the promise of a pension); to deduct accurately true expenses from gross income (thus, a barrister may regard the rent of his chambers as free of tax, but a writer may not deduct the proportionate rent of a quiet study which he may have been compelled to build).

An indefinite number of further considerations might be marshalled under this head. I have said enough to show that assessment can never be even approximately equitable. But apart from that injustice we have to notice for the particular purposes of this essay, which is not concerned with justice but only concerned with the limits of taxation, that *in all cases of inequality it is the inferior assessment and the superior sacrifice which regulates the rest, and when the limit of direct taxation is reached for the smaller or the more burdened man, it is reached for the whole community*; with the result that the limit of direct taxation is, from this inequality of assessment, reached much earlier in the scale of increase than should theoretically be the case, while the operation of that inequality works with more and more intensity in the presence of speculation—and speculation is the mark of a State rapidly developing in complexity and activity.

These first two factors of disturbance in the application of direct taxation, the psychology of the tax-payer and the inequality of assessment have, the first thoroughly, the second partially, received the attention of all critics. The third, which I am now about to examine, seems to me of far greater importance, both because it has not yet suffered analysis, and because it is in itself much the most important element in the fiscal problem with which modern England is faced.

It may briefly be stated thus:—

The limits of direct taxation are the more readily reached in an active and complex phase of commercial development, because in such a phase the sum of individual assessments, however accurate, greatly exceeds the true taxable wealth of the community.

In other words the utmost effective economic demand of the community is less than the apparent sum of all individual effective economic demands; and the difference between that utmost common demand and the apparent sum of individual demands increases with the complexity and activity of the State.

This thesis I shall now proceed to prove.

If a man were asked to assess a community, he would demand privately of each individual or family, or he would ascertain by means of neighbours or of registered transactions, what each unit, each individual or family, disposed of in the course of the year. This would be the simplest, the most obvious and, on the face of it, the most just method. Upon such assessments, it would seem that a levy of such and such a percentage (graduated perhaps according to the scale of income) could have no criticism brought against it.

Now to show how gross the injustice of such a method might be, and how easily such a method might, upon quite a small levy, exhaust the resources of a community, let the crude and extreme example be taken of a community in which one man disposes of all the means of production of the area under assessment. He is, we will suppose, the owner of that soil and those machines which produce all that the community may require, and this we will imagine to be one thousand measures of wheat, one thousand of wood, one thousand of wool, and one thousand of fresh meat.

A thousand families, if we include his own, exist upon this area, and among them consume, or at least can put forward an effective economic demand for, the thousand measures of each of the four products here postulated; for where there is no foreign tribute to pay or to receive, total production and total effective demand are equivalent terms.

The owner is himself, with his family, capable of consuming no more than ten portions out of the thousand. But of the remainder he disposes in the following fashion: Ninety portions he bestows upon persons who produce no wealth but who minister in some way to his amusement, or are even dependent upon his charity. Let these account for nine families. Of the remaining nine hundred portions to be distributed among the remaining nine hundred families, five hundred go to one hundred families who do indeed perform a useful office for him (though not for themselves) such as taking him about from place to place, or transporting opportunities of pleasure at his convenience.

The remaining four hundred units are distributed among the eight hundred remaining families who perform the useful work of producing the material wealth which all enjoy.

Now let us strike a scale of incomes and of taxation. We have one class (the proprietor) enjoying ten measures of wheat, of wool,

of wood and of fresh meat; we have next a class nine times as numerous enjoying the same amounts. We have next a class who have upon the average five such measures, and beneath them the great bulk of the working community enjoying but half such a measure each.

Let us tax them all at ten per cent., and see what follows. His income is one thousand measures, he pays into the Exchequer a hundred measures. The next class pay in nine measures which makes a hundred and nine. The third class pay in fifty measures, which makes just under a hundred and sixty. And the last class pay in forty measures, which makes the total just under two hundred. That is, your ten per cent. income-tax is very nearly doubled by your method of assessment in such a case. The material wealth of the community is not enlarged because the proprietor happens to have varying tastes, to desire to move from place to place or to have now singers, now dancers for his amusement; the amount of material objects disposable for consumption is the same as would have been present had the whole soil been divided, family by family, and had each been assessed at the true gross revenue of each; yet the latter apparent assessment would have been but just over half the former.

This example is of course purposely extreme and crude; but it suffices to show the manner in which assessment, when it is taken as the sum of individual incomes, exaggerates the true real income of the community. Rebates for what are called (in our modern anarchic system) "expenses," the exemption of the poorest class, a graduation between various classes, all abate the evil. But no palliative can get rid of the fundamental vice in every such system of assessment, that the total real effective demand of the community is exaggerated when we add together the nominal individual effective demands.

Let us take an example which, while it is still extreme, is a little more actual. Let A be living on the land of B, and B be living on the land of A; the rent which A pays to B is reckoned as part of B's income. Conversely, what B pays to A is counted in A's income. Let A possess an effective demand for one thousand units of value in the year. Let B have the same advantages. Let us suppose that the rent of either is five hundred units. Let us further suppose that B cannot live unless he takes all the produce of A, and A cannot live unless he takes all the produce of B. There we have again a double assessment. Such complete conditions of converse exchange could not of course be discovered; the rent of "business" premises is allowed, "expenses" are allowed, in any system of direct taxation; still there is always a vast leakage, and the total values taxed are much less than the total apparent values in the command of A and of B.

I will take a particular concrete example. This will perhaps make

my argument the more appreciable. I will suppose a man, possessed of an effective demand which he would set down at £1,500 a year, to lay aside £25 of this for coal. It is not an extravagant supposition. Now I will suppose this man to be tempted or compelled to journey several times to Penzance, to the extent, let us say, of £5, and I will trace that particular £5, not in the abstract terms of currency, but in terms of the material commodity called coal. Of this £5, one pound, let us say, is given to managers, clerks and what not by the railway company in the form of wages, and we will particularly regard such part of those wages as they turn into coal. Of the remaining £4, three are paid out to innumerable forms of human energy, and profit on capital, and royalties, and we will consider them as being turned into coal. It is not an extravagant supposition, for all classes of the community need this commodity. There remains one pound. The directors find it possible to distribute it as dividend, and with this dividend their shareholders buy coal. The whole transaction might have been effected by the traveller's going to Paddington with his ton of coal and giving it to the G.W.R. to distribute.

Now the State is demanding a shilling in the pound, or a hundredweight from every ton of coal. If it taxed every citizen equally it would first come to the man that travelled to Penzance and say: "You must give me five hundredweight of coal;" it would next go to all the other people in order and between them all it would collect four hundredweight of coal, to be duly burnt in a Government office. First and last it would have nine hundredweight of coal out of that wretched original five tons, or very nearly ten per cent. instead of five; nearly two shillings in the pound instead of one.

It is true, of course, that the State lets off the majority of citizens, allows for this or for that, and attempts to distinguish between things consumed in production and things consumed in enjoyment. The exaggeration is nothing near so large as these obvious examples would make it. Nevertheless it exists. It is there in principle; it always appears in some degree, and in general it may be asserted that the method of assessment which concerns itself with private incomes alone, rather than with articles of commerce and of production, is vicious in proportion as the activities of the State increase; in proportion, that is, as men travel more, exchange more, and more give themselves to changing employments and pleasures.

A method of escape may be suggested by those who propose the assessment of property rather than of revenue.

It is indeed by far the juster method to assess a man's grip on the means of production than to assess the total produce which not only natural forces but his own powers may have helped to call forth. But even this method is open to the same criticism, that direct taxation always over-estimates the amount to be taxed.

The assessment of property in this manner suffers from a double

flaw; if it is an assessment based upon a capitalised rental, then the total tax demanded will increase out of proportion to the total productivity of the community; if it is an assessment of things saleable, that assessment will include numerous items corresponding to no real wealth, and the items increase in importance and number as the activity of the State increases.

Consider the first of these points, for all assessments based upon a capitalisation of yearly value include the element of *economic rent*. How the total assessment of rental exaggerates the basis of taxation will not take long to show.

Rental is estimated in that surplus which remains after the earnings of capital and labour are satisfied. All that is just upon, or barely above, this margin of production, does not enter into such an assessment. Now it is evident that if we increase the productivity of any given area the proportion which rises above the taxable limit will increase out of all proportion to the total productivity. For instance, if we imagine three farms of similar area in each of which £1,000 of produce a year satisfies the worth-while of capital and of labour, and if we imagine the first to produce £1,100, the next £1,200 and the next £1,300, then the total taxable rental will be £600 out of £3,600 of produce. But let some discovery in communications or manures or what-not decrease the expenses or increase the earnings of each by £100, then the total taxable amount will be increased by fifty per cent.—from £600 to £900, though the total value produced will have been increased by no more than a twelfth—from £3,600 to £3,900.

As to the second point, all assessments in a condition of high commercial development include instruments of credit which sometimes represent no real values whatsoever and which, even when they do represent real values, overlap in all directions. They further include expectations, gambling chances and exaggerated estimates which much more than compensate for the occasional depreciation of true values—a share in a lottery will always fetch far more than its value as a chance, and active commerce is essentially speculative. That worthless paper which the South African promoter palms off upon his dupes pay death duties. What was it ever worth?

To sum up: It is a constantly recurring historical phenomenon that direct taxation reaches its limit at a comparatively low level in a highly developed State.

This phenomenon is dependent:—

First, upon *the psychology of the tax-payer*; because in such a society he is remote from the effect of the tax and he cannot but regard the tax as an unremunerative payment, consonant to no direct or measurable good, and forced upon him at a moment for which he may not have prepared; which payment assumes in his mind a nature quite different from multiple small, daily payments for

things producing him a tangible, material benefit; and because he cannot but, in a highly-developed society, budget for his social position, he cannot move up and down the social ladder at will.

Secondly, it is dependent upon the *necessary inequality of assessment*; which inequality works like a ratchet and wheel, forcing down direct taxation to the limit of the least able; just as the march of a column is regulated by the rate of march of its slowest unit.

Thirdly, this phenomenon of the rapid arrival at the limit of direct taxation, from which all high civilisations have suffered, is still more dependent upon, and in a complex commercial civilisation principally dependent upon, the fact that *an addition of apparent individual incomes or properties exaggerates, and largely exaggerates, the total material resources of the State.*

I have but sketched out some few considerations in this matter. Many more will suggest themselves to the reader; many criticisms will also suggest themselves as, for instance, that the State, while levying by direct taxation so much too large a proportion of real wealth, yet makes some compensation by spending much of its acquired economic demand ineffectually again upon useless services and unproductive energies.

I might further have developed these minor accidents upon which I have not touched, which yet so gravely interfere with the efficiency of any system of direct taxation. I might have mentioned many another cause of the weakness in that system, the exaggeration due to deferred payments, the cumulative injustice of taxation at source, the lack of rebate upon repaid loans, the confusion of just rebate and of unjust rebate upon interest and upon insurance, imaginary assessments attaching to mutual transactions of credit, and a hundred others. I have left all these aside because my limits did not permit me to take a complete view, and also because I wished to maintain some clarity in the treatment of a subject by nature difficult.

My object has been but to sketch in the outline of a theory I hope later to complete, whereby it may be understood why in a society still flourishing and active we have reached, as we certainly have reached, the limit of revenue gathered upon traditional lines.

HILAIRE BELLOC.

THE FAIR COMPLEXION.

I N every country where scientific observations have been made the fair complexion proves to be dying out. Professor Mason, of the Smithsonian Institute, has predicted that in six centuries it will vanish altogether unless the decline be checked. That is a bold computation which cannot be verified, but in very much less time light hair and grey eyes will become rare if the process of extinction continues. Mayr, Virchow, Livi, Lapouge, Ammon, have investigated the matter in Bavaria, Germany, Italy, France, Austria; Beddoes, Shrubbsall and others in this country. Everywhere the conclusion is the same—a dark type supersedes the fair. A few years ago the *British Medical Journal* raised objections to some of the arguments advanced, but at the close it mournfully admitted that “the fair hair “so much beloved by poets and artists seems to be encroached upon “and even replaced by that of darker hue.” It is a melancholy prospect for the æsthetic. Even peoples like the Spanish and Italians, with whom black locks are the rule, conceive celestial beings as fair. Is there a brunette Madonna or Bambino other than those wonder-working pictures which lay no claim to art? But I apprehend that consequences might follow even graver than the loss of beauty.

It cannot be an accident that nearly all those conquering races which were also colonisers have been fair. Perhaps there is only one indisputable exception—the Arab; for of the tribes which furnished a large proportion of the Roman armies in the earliest time, some were blonde, doubtless as the Samnite. So it was with the Spanish conquerors; one may see flaxen hair, blue eyes, and even red cheeks in Costa Rica, Segovia and elsewhere not infrequently to this day. But set against the dark colonising people which might be found the multitude of Gauls, Teutons, Slavs, Greeks, Scandinavians, English in Europe; Persians, Medes, Indian Aryans, Afghans, of Asia; the preponderance of the fair is overwhelming. Some names in this list may surprise the “general reader”—as the Persian. The people so-

called nowadays are not blonde. I can only advise the bewildered to make enquiry.

We may suppose that famine, growth of population, or encroachment of enemies set the invaders moving, rather than their own impulse. But the dark races must have been subjected to the same pressure from time to time. Why did not like causes produce like results with them? Often enough they started on a career of conquest, when urged by greed for plunder or driven by warlike chiefs; but these were military enterprises, not migrations. Assyria colonised in a way, but to so little purpose that when the empire fell those offshoots silently disappeared. I remember no other instance worth note. But in times before history began, forgotten by legend, fair races had marched over half the earth, and peopled North India, Persia, Media, Armenia—if, as most authorities agree at present, the "Aryan home" was in Europe. And such movements recurred until the establishment of the Pax Romana—to burst out more tremendous than ever, as that obstacle decayed. There are no incidents of the kind in the story of the dark races.

The complexion of the historic Greeks has often been discussed by the learned, who are not unanimous. They themselves thought it beneath the dignity of literature to describe the bodily appearance of people, unless some extraordinary characteristic demanded notice. I need not raise the question here. No one disputes that the Macedonians were blonde. And there is visible evidence to show that in the early time the Greeks were blonde also. Contemporary portraits of the Achæan and Danaan raiders whom Ramses II. vanquished with difficulty leave no room for doubt. Not less convincing to my mind are the descriptions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Homer scarcely conceived a hero with dark hair; he grants Odysseus a black beard once, I think, but elsewhere the King of Ithaca always has golden locks, like his friends and the brave among his enemies. Helen, Nausicaa and ladies in general are fair; so are the gods and goddesses save a few characteristic exceptions. But if we put any faith in the legend of Homer it must be supposed that the Ionian nobles who entertained him had the same complexion, or they would surely have been vexed to hear it assigned to all the best and bravest—even to the gods themselves, as if in itself divine. To please an audience of brown people the leading characters of the story at least must be brown.

But it is the Athenians who interest us especially. At the present time they are short, snub and blonde, being Slavs or Tosk Albanians by race; but a Professor of the University once informed me that a tall, fair-haired, blue-eyed stock survives, represented by very small communities dwelling in the remotest glens, to which invaders have rarely penetrated and tourists never. The Athenians of old believed themselves to the earth-born, and they certainly escaped when the

greater part of Greece was overrun in that mysterious cataclysm known as the Return of the Heracleidæ. Herodotus makes the positive statement that they were Pelasgians. Books have been written about this semi-mythic race, and most authorities agree that it is represented at the present day by the Albanians of the North, called Ghegghes; the Tosk clans are degenerate, mixed with Serb, Greek and Italian blood. If the Athenians resembled the modern Ghegghes they were tall, fair-haired and blue-eyed. The Tanagra figurines tell a story. All of good class were painted, and in most something of the colour remains. One must search long to find a trace of dark hair. I should say that of the famous examples ninety-nine in a hundred are blonde or downright red, but the latter tint may be due to over baking. Tanagra was Boeotian, but on the very border-line of Attica. We know that the Boeotians were fair, in the capital at least; and townspeople are always darker than the rustic population. The earliest of guide books, assigned to Dicæarchus, gives a sketch of the Theban women. "They are the tallest, handsomest and most graceful of all Hellas. They muffle their faces so that only the eyes are seen. All dress in white, and wear low purple shoes, displaying the naked feet. Their yellow hair is tied in a knot above the head. Their voices are pleasing, while those of the men are harsh and deep." This pretty picture shows that in the last century B.C., for all that had come and gone, one of the most important races of Greece remained fair.

But it is not only the fighting, migrating peoples who were distinguished by this complexion. It belonged also to the enterprising Italian stocks. Romanin states, quoting from ancient Chronicles, that the Venetians of the early time, who laid the foundations of the empire, were "large, fair-haired and strong—the women famous for their golden tresses." This latter charm, indeed, came to be reckoned a national characteristic, and for centuries every Venetian dame to whom Nature had refused it produced the effect by art. Portraits show that fair hair was common among the leading men of Genoa; it was common also probably among the populace. Years ago I chanced to be at Naples when a squadron of Italian warships put in there, and I was struck with the number of blondes among the officers who crowded the famous *Café de l'Europe*. They told me that the proportion was large because so many Genoese happened to be aboard.

It appears, therefore, that the peoples of fair complexion have proved themselves energetic and enterprising beyond others, saving the Roman, all over the world in all ages; for Arab activity did not last. I could show that the story of Africa offers no exception. Tall, blonde Berbers have played the same part there as the Gauls and Teutons in Europe, as Lady Lugard has pointed out. It was Berbers who conquered Spain, though we call them Moors. Thus complexion

becomes a fact of significance as an outward token of character. I noted a curious remark lately in Stephens' "Literature of the Kymry" bearing on this point. In dealing with the Mabinogion, the great collection of Welsh legendary stories, Mr. Stephens says: "The marvellous and moving power is seldom, indeed I may say never, personal courage, but invariably magic. Nothing could be more remote from the Kymric conception than knight-errantry. The spirit of adventure has no place in our national character; wherever it appears in our literature we shall not greatly err in assigning to it a foreign character." P. 399.) Ethnological tables class the Kymry as the darkest people of our island.

Complexion has no virtue in itself of course; as has been said, it is the visible sign of attributes and peculiarities which together make what we term the constitution. It might be that these would account for all, without reference to mental or moral qualities. If rosy skin, yellow hair, pale eyes correlate a bodily structure which enables men and women to resist the evil influences of climate, privation, excess, unaccustomed food and new circumstances generally, whilst a dead white skin, dark hair and eyes correlate a structure which does not carry these advantages, the case would be simple. Men of the latter type would have perished early had they set forth to overrun the world. Instinct even might have warned them against the adventure, or a short experience would suffice. In those primitive ages men stored experience and profited by it.

I, myself, with some knowledge of countries deemed specially unwholesome for Europeans, formerly accepted this explanation. When Darwin was investigating the effect of climate on human beings he asked the opinion of Dr. Daniell, who had lived long on the West Coast of Africa, "the white man's grave." Dr. Daniell replied that on his arrival, as a boy, an old negro told him that with such a florid complexion he was safe from fever—and so it proved. Mr. Harris, who also had resided many years on the West Coast, told Darwin that if he had to choose men for service on that deadly shore, he would take only the red-haired. I can answer for it that residents, black or white, hold the same view. I lived for some months at Cape Coast Castle with the representative of a great English firm. In a lifetime spent there—for Mr. Selby was a mulatto—he had known but a single red or flaxen-haired Englishman who died, Lieutenant Wells, R.N.; and I recollect the surprise of the natives when this poor fellow was struck down. In the Far East also and in Tropical America one finds people who assert that the blonde suffer less.

I am tempted to quote a passage from "A Modern Legionary" by Mr. J. Patrick Le Poer—premising that I am not acquainted with the author, nor have any means of judging how far his observations can be trusted. The latter part of the book is suspiciously romantic, but

details of service in the French Foreign Legion, which occupy three-fourths of it, seem to bear the stamp of truth—if only in their minuteness and their lack of interest for the public at large. After recounting the terrible campaign against the “Black Flags” in Cambodia, Mr. Le Poer discusses the soldier-like qualities of each nationality represented in the Foreign Legion, and there were many. He finds himself unable to set one above another for courage; “but,” he proceeds, “there was one class of men far more lively, far less given to grumbling, and altogether possessed of more brilliancy and resilience of temperament than the others. This was the men of fair complexion. All fair-haired, blue-eyed soldiers seemed able to withstand bad conditions of living more easily and better than their dark-complexioned comrades. I offer no explanation of this fact, which I noted for the first time during the voyage out. Afterwards I had many opportunities, confirming my impression that fair men are superior to dark in endurance and everything else connected with war except the actual fighting; with regard to that, complexion does not count. I noticed in the fever hospitals that black moustaches far outnumbered fair; in the field hospitals there was no such disparity. I merely put on record a thing I noticed; I never mentioned it to my comrades.”

This is striking evidence—if we can rely upon it; exactly what was wanted to justify a belief that the blonde races owe their predominance to physical qualifications, the brunette equalling them in courage and virile merits.

Unfortunately, scientific returns do not bear out this conclusion so far. In all civilised countries at the present time students are patiently exploring a field which Dr. Beddoes had all to himself half-a-century ago. But little has been ascertained with certainty as yet about the physical distinctions which are marked by the fair and dark complexions. It is a task for doctors, and few as yet have been enlisted, comparatively. In this island they are at a disadvantage. Elsewhere conscription, which draws together a multitude from every class and nationality in the realm, whose age and circumstances can be learned in every detail, gives a broad and sure foundation on which to build if they care to use it. Here we must depend upon observations made in the hospitals, and the number which a very few individuals can collect, however zealous and industrious, is not yet enough to justify full confidence in the result. Dr. Shrubsall is our leading authority, and for the statements that follow, I am indebted especially to his monographs upon “Physical Deterioration” in *St. Bartholomew's Hospital Journal*, and “Physical Characters and Morbid Proclivities” in *St. Bartholomew's Hospital Reports*, Vol. XXXIX.

We may almost conclude that pulmonary tuberculosis, better recognised under the name of consumption, attacks the dark

especially. Returns from St. Bartholomew's give 22 red-haired patients, 44 light-haired and 125 dark-brown haired; the City Hospital gives 2, 2, and 13; Brompton Hospital, 4, 17 and 43. It is notable that the black-haired yield no more than the red; but the ebon hue thus described is very rare in England. The same tendency has been observed in some foreign countries—not in all; possibly because pulmonary tuberculosis is not clearly distinguished from other complaints of its order in their reports. The picture dear to sentiment of a maiden with locks of gold and eyes of azure perishing from consumption, is not to be regarded as typical—to be representative her tresses should be dark brown with eyes to match. I should state here that Dr. Shruballs has carefully excluded Jewish and other immigrants from his tables everywhere. Being mostly dark they would confuse the issue.

A conclusion of greater importance in our point of view is the predilection of acute rheumatism, and its attendant complications, for the fair. This also is admitted, and denied, abroad. In St. Bartholomew's there is "a marked excess of fair patients." Sir William Church was struck with the great number of cases at Whitehaven and the Isle of Man, districts inhabited mostly by a Norwegian stock, the fairest and almost the tallest in England. On the other hand, acute rheumatism and valvular disease of the heart, which is attributed to it, are much less common in Devonshire and Cornwall, which belong to the dark areas of the island. One might have expected that wandering hosts like the blonde migrants should be specially immune to these complaints, if their advantage lay in constitutional peculiarities. Not less would one expect to find them proof, comparatively, against diseases of the liver. But it would seem that these, exclusive of malignant forms, "show no definite attraction in any one direction; if anything, they tend towards the brunette, and kidney diseases towards the blonde type." A mere inclination will not support a theory either way. Perhaps, however, evidence collected from patients in London hospitals is of little value in these instances. If fresh air be an essential of life for the blonde, as will be shown, the proportion of those attacked by disorders of the liver when deprived of that necessary by living in close streets must be far higher than that of the brunette who are much less dependent on it. The antecedent conditions are not equal.

Upon the other hand, few will be surprised to hear that nervous diseases generally assail the brunette type. An old practitioner of the Shetlands told Dr. Beddoes on his arrival that the few dark people of the island supplied more instances of these complaints than all the many fair, and his own experience confirmed the statement. Dr. Shruballs's observations in London agree. Such few statistics as I have seen suggest that lunacy is more common among brunettes, though violent mania attacks the fair especially. Dr. Jones, at the

Metropolitan Asylum, Claybury, notes "an unusual frequency of 'dark hair.' Persons of that type suffer most from monomania and melancholic illusions, "especially those of dark leaden skin, fixed and sullen "aspect and lank coal-black hair." This is the "true enthusiast's "complexion" of Carlyle. Finally, malignant diseases in general, and cancer in particular, show a definite attraction towards the brunette rather than the blonde type in London hospitals.

A comparative record of other maladies will be found in Drs. Beddoes and Shruballs' publications. I quote a few statistics from St. Bartholomew's Hospital Reports:—

	Red.	Fair.	Light Brown.	Dark Brown.	Black.
Chronic Bronchitis	1.7	16.3	44.9	35.9	1.0
Digestive Disorders	1.5	13.6	46.3	36.2	2.4
Here light brown suffers most, but—					
Pulmonary Tuberculosis ...	6.9	11.7	33.8	40.0	7.5
Malignant Disease	5.8	9.0	27.0	48.4	9.8
Nervous Disease	0.6	11.1	36.4	46.3	5.6
Anæmia	2.9	15.5	34.6	43.7	2.9

favour the dark brown, which we class as the brunette type.

Commenting on his own observations at Bristol, when he had few associates, if any, in the labour of research, Dr. Beddoes wrote: "These tables do not tend to bear out the widely-diffused and popular "idea that light-haired and light-eyed people are, on the whole, more "subject to disease." Still less do the later returns. But there are not such differences as would give the explanation we seek. Doubtless, as has been said, patients in a London hospital represent only the shadow of those stalwart forefathers of ours who seemed a race of giants to the Romans; but we must make the best of their evidence until better is forthcoming. I should add, however, that foreign reports do not always agree, nor are unanimous on any single point perhaps. Statistics from the Provost-Marshal General's Bureau at Washington, dealing with recruits in the Civil War, are interpreted by Dr. Baxter to prove that "the brunette type as a whole offers greater resistance to "disease." The truth is that an international system of classification has not yet been adopted. "Fair" and "dark" have varying significance in various countries, and different conclusions can be registered from the facts.

If we might suppose that red hair was much more common than now in ancient times, among the fair, the problem would be simple. Doubtless the reader marked how small is the proportion of that class in the tables quoted. Dr. Shruballs says: "It would almost appear "that such individuals are less liable to intrinsic disease when liable "and exposed to infection like others," and again: "Rufous individuals "show a marked immunity from the more trivial complaints—or

"perhaps they do not attend hospitals for treatment. On the other hand, they show no such immunity from the more serious maladies." It is not serious maladies, however, which crowd the field hospitals when an army is on the march—excepting dysentery, of which we have no record—for epidemics are not counted, of course.

As a supposition it does not seem unlikely that red hair should have been more prevalent formerly. The tint assigned to Gauls and Teutons, as a rule, is yellow, but sometimes they are described as red. The Greek "*xanthous*" might mean either. And the recklessness of the ancients in the use of colour names is well understood: "*hyacinths are black, crocuses red,*" and Virgil represents Turnus "*vomiting his purple soul,*" as Isaac Disraeli noted.

But when history begins to report the habits and opinions of the Northern races on their own authority, it appears that red-haired men are disliked and distrusted, which suggests at least that they are a minority. Their courage and dash receive due honour. "I never heard of a red-haired man, who was faint-hearted!" cried Olaf Tryggvasson, when his steersman proposed a strategic movement to the rear at the battle of Svold. But they were accounted treacherous by nature. When Ashbjorn murdered Canute II. at Odense, "*foulest deed ever wrought in the story of the Northmen,*" we are told, the indignant chronicler wonders that the King should have trusted a red-haired man.

A German proverb is current to this day: "From a red-haired man and a Swede the Lord deliver us!" A version of the fable about the Fox and the Goose, not later than the tenth century, ends with the moral, "*Monet haec fabula rufos evitare;*" and Alfred declares outright in one of his proverbs: "A red-haired man is a rogue, quarrelsome, a thief, the King of mischief"—one may fancy that some individual of that complexion had provoked the gentle monarch lately. This is enough to show that we cannot safely assume the proportion of red-haired to have been greater than now. People do not speak ill of a personal characteristic which very many of their fellows display; for one reason because they dare not, especially in the case of men notorious for hot temper, recklessness and vengeful disposition. Geraldus Cambrensis says that William Rufus was not so called because he had red hair—for it was flaxen—but because he was so diabolically wicked.

Apparently, then, it was not physical attributes but greater energy, enterprise, longing for adventure, that caused the fair races to play the leading part in the story of mankind. They have been the disrupting force of humanity from the inroad of the "*Cimmerians*"—which brought about the fall of Nineveh, and left the great province of "*Galatia*" to tell to future ages the real name of those mysterious invaders—to the outburst of the Reformation, and on to the settlement of America and Australasia. If this complexion be declining now and

vanishing, those who fancy that "the Aryan is played out" may find there a striking confirmation of their views. The fact is assured at any rate, and the cause of it ascertained; the constitution indicated by light hair and eyes is not adapted to the conditions of town life. And towns grow without ceasing at the expense of the country; the last census demonstrated an increase of 15 per cent. in the ten years preceding. Seventy-seven per cent. of us already have deserted the wholesome fields for the poisoned streets. The same fatal process is working all over Europe, even in Russia and the Danubian Principalities, always accompanied by a multiplication of the brunette type and a diminution of the blonde. Perhaps it is on a calculation of the rate at which towns are increasing that Professor Mason prophesies the absolute extinction of the fair in six centuries, as has been noted.

Before any one, perhaps, had concerned himself with these questions, Dr. Beddoes wrote: "In my experience as a physician it has appeared that, on the whole, dark-complexioned children show more tenacity of life than fair ones, under some of the unfavourable conditions of town life." That observation is echoed from all parts of the world now.

Of children, those with flaxen or light brown hair seem to be more subject to disease, and their mortality seems to be higher—we must speak cautiously because statistics are not yet forthcoming in sufficient volume. But Dr. Shrubsall has made observations at St. Bartholomew's, and Dr. Jones at the North Eastern Hospital for Children, dealing with rather more than a thousand little invalids in all; and both series of figures "show a marked predominance not only of blonde traits, but also of the pure blonde type, indicating a greater amount of disease." It is the close air and the foul stench of the slums, perhaps the moral filth also, which the fair complexion cannot endure, for its diminution becomes less and less conspicuous, even in large towns, as these influences are left behind. The darkest areas of London are West Clerkenwell, Stepney, Whitechapel and St. George's in the East, but here the foreign Jews and Italians congregate. Finsbury and Southwark stand next, and aliens have not yet displaced the native population there: "Where the conditions are more favourable, such as boroughs in which are large model dwellings, with plenty of open space around, the blonde seem nearly to hold their own and in the suburban areas do so with success." Thus the lightest districts are Kensington, Mayfair and Belgravia. The conclusion is that the fair type must die out if deprived of fresh air, whilst the dark suffers comparatively little. It is a striking example of natural selection and the survival of the fittest under an unnatural state of things.

Overcrowding appears to signify little where the environment is wholesome. At the meeting of the British Association in 1904, Mr. Arthur Balfour pointed out that when he was young farm labourers in his neighbourhood had but one small room generally, where they lived

with a wife and many children; but this little corner of the Lowlands produced the largest specimens of the human race. The latter statement was inexact—it does not produce the largest specimens even of Scotland; but Mr. Balfour might have said, with truth, the fairest, or at least, as fair as any. Children may survive and keep their health, however unfavourable the surroundings, if they get a sufficient supply of pure air.

But there is another cause which affects the rural population. Professor Ripley asserts that in the close neighbourhood of London the average stature of the people is even lower than in the Metropolis itself, and they are darker mostly. This he attributes to the constant migration of the taller individuals, who seek "to better themselves" in town. But the tall, as a class, are the fair; moreover, if our argument be sound, they are the more enterprising. And this rule applies to emigrants generally; the fair go, the dark, less inclined for adventure, remain, to propagate their like in the Mother Country. In his "Races of Britain" Dr. Beddoes referred to the decline of the Swiss in stature and in fairness of complexion. The country was occupied by the Allemanni, of purest Teutonic blood, whose gigantic skeletons astonish men of the present day. They conquered a browner, shorter race, upon whom they imposed their language and habits. All the world knows how the Swiss fought in the Middle Ages. But as a consequence of those famous victories, their country became the recruiting ground of Europe, and, says Dr. Beddoes, "it seems probable that the tall blonde element would emigrate," that is, enlist for foreign service, "at a more rapid rate than the brown short-headed people." A great proportion never returned; those who did were comparatively old; the less adventurous dark race stopped at home and multiplied, and now again possess the land. The same process is working here in these peaceful times.

Is there any chance that the fair complexion may make a new start, as it were, reappear triumphant in some unexpected district and spread thence as once it did? For all authorities agree that it represents a change in the pristine coloration of humanity; but how, why and where the change occurred they do not agree. The Italian *savant* Livi imagines it arising at various centres where food was scarce and un nourishing, and the population miserably poor—probably mountainous places, but he does not think the latter condition necessary. Beddoes asks, "Is it conceivable that some defect of phosphoretic salts in the soil may have had such influence?" and he suggests the alluvial marshlands in the North Sea. Dr. Lathau remarked that "the blonde area is among the moister parts of the world. When ethnological science shall have become more extensively studied than it is, it will probably be seen that the populations of the area in question are those most afflicted with scrofula." This pleasing theory is broached in "Man-

"and His Migrations"; I am not aware that it has found much support. Dr. Penka's idea is more agreeable. He thinks that the first blondes were palæolithic savages in Southern Scandinavia, bleached by subjection to an Arctic climate for generations innumerable. Finally, Professor Pösche, most renowned of all who speculate upon the subject, searching his map for a spot which presented all the conditions he holds necessary, found the great Rokitno swamp, between the Beresina and the Dnieper rivers. The number of Albinos there at the present day is remarkable, and the rest have flaxen or lint-white hair. They are tall and muscular, but weakly of constitution as of intelligence; Canon Taylor described them as "tow-headed idiots." But here Pösche set the prototypes and the ancestors of all blonde folk. I have no opinion to offer. But all these suggestions recognise that time to be measured by hundreds of centuries must have been employed in the making of the fair complexion. The process cannot be repeated.

FREDK. BOYLE.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN CHINA.

Some few months ago a Committee (under the name of the China Missions Emergency Committee) was formed at the instance of the Statesman-Missionary, Dr. Timothy Richard of Shanghai, to look at the question of the scope and working of the Protestant missions in China, in view of the recent awakening of that country to the advantages of Western culture, and to consider what could be done, from a National point of view, to bring some of the benefits of Western civilisation to the vast Chinese Empire. As a preliminary step, four gentlemen representing the Committee attended the recent Missionary Conference in Shanghai, and visited divers mission stations in China. One of them, the Rev. Lord William Gascoyne-Cecil, has published the results of his observation in some very interesting letters in the *Times*. The other three, Mr. Francis William Fox, Professor Alexander Macalister, of Cambridge, and Sir Alexander Simpson, of Edinburgh, have presented to the Committee the following Report, which is here printed at the request of the Committee.

IN view of the recent remarkable awakening in China, and the strong desire on the part of the Chinese for a knowledge of Western civilisation and science, an influential Committee, "The China Missions Emergency Committee," was appointed last year, including in its membership an equal number of prominent representatives of the Anglican Church as well as of the Free Churches of Great Britain, to consider in what ways it might assist the missionary societies and their representatives in China in adjusting and extending their existing operations, so that the momentous demands now made upon them by the surprising changes of thought and policy that have so suddenly emerged, may be adequately met.

This Committee, which meets at the Deanery, Westminster, also hopes to be able to inform and arouse the Christian conscience of this country with regard to the opportunities and responsibilities that are now pressed upon us to assist China in the stupendous work of social and spiritual reconstruction upon which she has entered.

It appointed as its representatives the Rev. Lord William and Lady Florence Gascoyne-Cecil, of Hatfield; Sir Alexander R. Simpson, of Edinburgh; Professor Alexander Macalister, of Cambridge; and Mr. Francis William Fox, of London, to attend the Missionary Conference held at Shanghai from April 26th to May 7th last, and also to pay a series of visits to missionaries and mission stations, for the purpose of learning from the most experienced missionaries what measures should be adopted to meet the new demands that had arisen.

Besides attending the Conference and having interviews with a

large number of missionaries, the Committee's representatives were present at a meeting, presided over by Sir Alexander Simpson, of the leading medical missionaries of China attending the Conference, who were specially invited to meet us, at the headquarters at Shanghai of the London Missionary Society.

On another occasion three of our members were invited by the representatives of the American Laymen's Missionary Movement to unite with them in receiving all the missionaries attending the Conference at an afternoon reception and tea at the Astor House Hotel, when some 800 were entertained by us as our guests.

Your representatives were also kindly invited by the Rev. Dr. Gilbert Reid to meet some of the prominent Shanghai merchants at a luncheon at the Shanghai Club.

Lord Wm. Cecil preached a sermon on the "Unity of Christendom," appropriate for the occasion of the meeting of the Conference, at the Shanghai Cathedral one Sunday morning.

After the Conference was over, we separated in different directions. Professor Macalister proceeded to visit the mission stations of the English Presbyterian Church in the South of China and Formosa, including those at Amoy and Swatow. Sir Alexander Simpson had previously visited Hongkong, Amoy and Swatow; and, after the Conference, spent a day at the American Methodist Episcopal Mission at Soochow.

Lord Wm. and Lady Florence Cecil made a series of visits to Hongkong, Canton, Shanghai, Hangchow, Ningpo, Soochow, Nanking, Hankow, Wuchang, Peking, Nankow, Newchwang, Dalny and Port Arthur. Mr. Fox visited the several missions at Soochow, Ningpo, Chefoo, Tientsin, Peking, Wuchang, Hankow, Foochow and Hongkong, and was also asked to preside over a Conference held at the China Inland Mission's headquarters at Shanghai, convened for the purpose of considering and discussing the proposal to establish a College or a University at Chentu, the principal city of the Szechuen Province.

He was also present at a social meeting given by the Christian Literature Society of China, presided over by the well-known senior missionary in China, and the first President of the Peking University, the Rev. Dr. W. A. P. Martin, of Peking, at which meeting the Rev. Dr. Timothy Richard delivered an impressive address as to the highly important, far-reaching, and influential character of the work of that useful society.

Dr. Timothy Richard and the Hon. Mrs. Gordon kindly arranged to invite about 14 Chinese students and professional men, members of the Chinese Students' Federation, to meet Mr. Fox at an afternoon tea at the Astor House Hotel. This proved an interesting occasion.

Lord Wm. and Lady Florence Cecil and Mr. Fox were present at Peking at an afternoon reception, kindly given by H.M. Minister, Sir

John Jordan and Lady Jordan, to all the Protestant missionaries at Peking.

Previously to the Shanghai Conference, Sir Alexander Simpson, Professor A. Macalister, and Mr. Fox attended the interesting International Conference of the World's Students' Christian Federation at Tokyo, Japan, from April 3rd to April 7th, and in this way became more or less acquainted with the recent remarkable progress of Christianity and of Christian work in Japan and Korea, as well as that amongst the 15,000 Chinese students temporarily residing in Japan.

We further learnt particulars of the great influence that the Japanese were exercising, and were likely to exercise for some time, in the development of the Chinese Empire and the Chinese people.

CHRISTIAN UNITY IN CHINA.

We were much interested in attending the Shanghai Conference, and were greatly struck with the gracious spirit of unity and Christian love which pervaded all its deliberations.

This was all the more remarkable when it is borne in mind that the 1,200 delegates and visitors attending its various sessions represented some 50 different Western missionary societies, and that many of the questions discussed were of great importance, and involved, necessarily, considerable diversity of opinion.

The Conference was held in the Martyrs' Hall of the new building, erected by the Chinese Young Men's Christian Association, in memory of the Chinese and foreign martyrs who sacrificed their lives in the cause, and for the sake, of their Christian faith during the last century.

The Conference was alternately presided over most ably and acceptably by the Rev. Dr. J. C. Gibson, of Swatow, and the Rev. Dr. Arthur H. Smith, of Shanghai. The secretarial duties were efficiently carried out by the Rev. C. H. Bondfield, the Superintending Agent in Shanghai of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

It was generally recognised that the leading feature of the Conference was the earnest desire, manifested by all its members, that a practical unity of the Western Evangelical Churches should be presented to the Christian converts, and that, as far as practicable, the foundation of a United Native Chinese Church should be truly and promptly laid, as it was unanimously felt that the unhappy national, historical, provincial, and local divisions of Western Christianity should, as far as possible, be excluded from the new Christian Church of China.

We can but explain their views by quoting the following resolutions which were passed at the Conference:—

Resolution 2.

Whereas it is frequently asserted that Protestant missions present

a divided front to those outside, and create confusion by a large variety of inconsistent teaching, and whereas the minds both of Christian and non-Christian Chinese are in danger of being thus misled into an exaggerated estimate of our differences, this Centenary Conference, representing all Protestant missions at present working in China, unanimously and cordially declares :

That this Conference unanimously holds the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the supreme standard of faith and practice, and holds firmly the primitive Apostolic faith ; further, while acknowledging the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed as substantially expressing the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, the Conference does not adopt any creed as a basis of church unity and leaves confessional questions to the judgment of the Chinese Church for future consideration, yet in view of our knowledge of each other's doctrinal symbols, history, work and character, we gladly recognise ourselves as already one body, teaching one way of eternal life, and calling men into one holy fellowship, and as one in our teaching as to the love of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, in our testimony as to sin and salvation, and our homage to the Divine and Holy Redeemer of men ; one in our call to the purity of the Christian life, and in our witness to the splendours of the Christian hope.

We frankly recognise that we differ as to methods of administration and church government ; and that some among us differ from others as to the administration of baptism ; and that there are some differences as to the statement of the doctrine of Predestination or the Election of Grace. But we unite in holding that these exceptions do not invalidate the assertion of our real unity in our common witness to the Gospel of the Grace of God.

Resolution 3.

That in planting the Church of Christ on Chinese soil, we desire only to plant one church under the sole control of the Lord Jesus Christ, governed by the Word of the Living God, and led by His guiding Spirit.

While freely communicating to these churches the knowledge of truth, and the rich historical experience to which older churches have attained, we fully recognise the liberty in Christ of the churches in China planted by means of the missions and churches which we represent (in so far as these churches are by maturity of Christian character and experience fitted to exercise it), and we desire to commit it in faith

and hope to the continued safe-keeping of its Lord, when the time shall arrive, which we eagerly anticipate, when it shall pass beyond our guidance and control.

Resolution 4.

That in this view we cordially undertake to submit very respectfully to the Home Churches which have sent us to China the following recommendations:—

- (a) That they should sanction the recognition by their missionaries of the right of the churches in China planted by them to organise themselves in accordance with their own views of truth and duty, suitable arrangements being made for the close representation of the missionaries on their governing bodies until these churches shall be in a position to assume the full responsibilities of self-support and self-government.
- (b) That they should abstain from claiming any permanent right of spiritual or administrative control over these churches.

Resolution 5.

This Conference having in Resolution 2 thankfully declared our essential unity as already existing, earnestly desires further that the unity should be fully manifested and made effective in the Chinese Church, and considers that the most urgent practical step for the present is to endeavour to unite the churches planted in China by different missions of the same ecclesiastical order, without regard to the nationality or other distinctive features of the several missions under whose care they have been formed, recognising the inherent liberties of these Chinese churches as members of the Body of Christ.

Resolution 6.

The Conference rejoices to know that steps in this direction have already been taken by various sections of the mission body, and further resolves to appoint a Committee to act for it as furthering and co-ordinating all such action. The Committee to be constituted as follows:—

It shall consist in the first instance of eight sub-committees, each representing one or more of the existing forms of church order.

* * * * *

Resolution 7.

While the appointment of these Committees contemplates the formation of six or more church organisations for the

Chinese Church in the first instance, it is the earnest hope of this Conference that these Chinese bodies, with the assistance and advice of the foreign missionaries, may from the first prepare to unite with each other in the closest practicable bonds of Christian fellowship, either in organic ecclesiastical union, or as a free federation, as they may be led by their own interpretation of the mind of Christ, and by the guidance given them in the providence of God, and through the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

Further, in order that the spread of Christ's Kingdom may be promoted in China, and that the representatives in that country of the various missionary societies should come closer together, it was resolved, "That this Conference recommends the formation of a Federal Union under the title, 'The Christian Federation of China.'"

That the objects of the Federation shall be to foster and encourage the sentiment and practice of union, to organise united effort wherever and whenever possible, and in general to seek through all such effort to hasten the establishment of the Kingdom of God in China.

That the work of the Federation shall be:—

- (a) To encourage everything that will demonstrate the existing essential unity of Christians. To watch for opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different bodies of Christians in China; and as opportunity offers, to initiate and arrange for representative meetings for the furtherance of Christian unity.
- (b) To devise and recommend plans whereby the whole field can be worked most efficiently and with the greatest economy in men and time and money.
- (c) To promote union in educational work.
- (d) The encouragement of the consideration of all questions as to how the various phases of Christian work can be carried on most efficiently, *e.g.*, translation and literary work, social work, medical work, evangelistic work, etc.
- (e) And in general to endeavour to secure harmonious co-operant and more effective work throughout the whole Empire.

During the course of our several visits in China we were profoundly impressed with the wonderful openings that seem everywhere to exist for the spread of the Gospel, and though at the same time we could not but be painfully aware of the appalling mass of ignorance, darkness, and misery in which the vast majority of the millions of China

are immersed, we also could not fail to recognise how widespread and far-reaching already are the influences of Christianity.

We doubt whether any in England realise the dangers to which missionaries have been exposed through long years of perils, which at present seem, we are thankful to hope, somewhat mitigated. Still, mission work in China is far from being a secure and safe calling, owing to the unhealthy nature of the climate in certain places and at certain seasons, and the risk to which isolated foreigners are always exposed in a land where the government is not strong.

We should also impress on our countrymen that the work has, as a whole, been done with great and extraordinary efficiency, and that the results have exceeded the most sanguine estimate of the most competent spectators. In this report, we are trying, therefore, not to criticise these excellent workers, but to represent their opinions as to their chief needs and requirements, for we are certain that if the average Christian at home realised those needs he would be only too willing to give liberally.

We would also warn people that hostile criticism often emanates from a real ignorance, on the part of those who live in the ports, with regard to the internal conditions of China, and of the difficulties that beset mission work in the very peculiar circumstances of Chinese life.

Whilst Christianity has a truly conservative and uplifting element, and is conducive to the best happiness, peace, and prosperity of any nation, and its converts and adherents are, as a rule, entirely opposed to revolutionary and violent methods and measures, yet it cannot be denied that the indirect results of the introduction into China of Western civilisation and education, without decidedly religious influences, are of a disintegrating character, and are calculated to raise up strenuous opposition to the existing order and methods of government.

We were informed that everywhere throughout the Empire a great struggle was going on between the reactionary or Old Chinese Party and the Reform Party. The former may be said to be the supporters of the Manchu dynasty and of the ancient customs, while the latter seem generally to be anti-dynastic and anxious to introduce Western civilisation and education, but the members of both parties are imbued with a strong desire to get rid of all foreigners and of foreign control.

Hence we became acutely alive to the fact that the position and surroundings of missionaries and foreigners in general, in every part of the Empire, are full of uncertainty.

It is, we believe, the opinion of the more experienced men in China that, whilst there may lie before China and the Chinese people a bright and hopeful future, yet, before she emerges from her present chaotic condition, she will have to pass through much sorrow and suffering.

It is thought by such men that her most enlightened statesmen were

perhaps too hasty in suddenly sweeping away all at once the ancient system of examinations, before other agencies and methods of reform had been gradually introduced, for though thousands of schools had been opened to teach Western knowledge, yet very many of them had since been compelled to be closed, or had proved practically ineffectual and useless, through lack of suitable teachers to impart the needful instruction, and many years must necessarily elapse before the requisite number of duly qualified teachers can be secured.

CHINESE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

The very legitimate cry of "China for the Chinese" can now be heard in every direction, and as in Japan, so in China we must expect that the Christian converts will demand before long to establish a Christian Church in China which will become self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating, and be independent of the control of the Christian organisations of the West.

We were greatly impressed with the self-sacrificing and devoted Christian lives of the missionaries in China, with the very effective and valuable work they are everywhere accomplishing, and with the remarkable fact that, in spite of the strenuous endeavours in 1900 to destroy completely all Christian missionaries and missions, as well as all foreigners, when upwards of 290 Protestant missionaries and their wives and children, and 16,000 Chinese converts, it is estimated, were massacred; whereas in 1876 there were in China 473 missionaries and their wives, and 13,035 communicants; in 1900 there were 2,785 missionaries and their wives, and 110,000 communicants or full Church members, which were increased in five years, after the terrible Boxer outbreak, to 3,750 missionaries (including wives), and to about 250,000 full Church and probationary members.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN CHINA.

We found everywhere throughout the Chinese Empire that greater religious liberty is enjoyed than is the case in many other parts of the world, and that, so long as the laws of the country are observed, there is, theoretically, no interference with the conscientious opinions of individuals, with, however, the exceptions that Chinese officials are required occasionally to perform certain ceremonies of an idolatrous character; that the Constitution of China recognises Confucianism, and tolerates Buddhism and Taoism, though these are mutually contradictory; and that in the treaties between China and the Western Powers the Chinese Government has provided complete freedom for the propagation and practice of Christianity on the part of foreigners as well as its own subjects.

WHAT CHRISTIANITY HAS BROUGHT TO CHINA.

Whilst the ancient ethics of China, which were at a later date collected and compiled by Confucius, have undoubtedly exercised for centuries a most beneficent and potent influence on the lives of Chinese and the Chinese nation, yet these ethics have altogether lacked that dynamic power to mould their character and uplift effectually their ideas and surroundings which Christianity alone of all religious beliefs of the world seems able to accomplish. Christianity has brought to the Chinese the knowledge of a supreme God of the Universe, who is the Heavenly Father of all men; of a Redeemer and Saviour; of sin and sinfulness; it has taught them that all the inhabitants of earth—men, women, and children—are alike equal in the sight of God, and are members of one world-wide brotherhood; that they have souls needing salvation, and that the position of women must be placed on the same basis as that of men. It has further revealed to them the joys and blessings and the sweetness of the Christian's home, and the power to live purer and truer lives; it has introduced into China a weekly day of rest, an institution previously unknown; it has developed in a marvellous way education and the Press; it has advocated the unbinding of the crippled feet of its women, and is thus likely to bring about the early emancipation from terrible sufferings and disabilities of nearly one-half the enormous population of that vast Empire; it has introduced new medical methods and skill, which already are lessening the untold bodily sufferings of its people; it has established hospitals and dispensaries, and institutions for the blind, the deaf and dumb, and lepers. Its representatives have denounced the improper use of opium, as well as the existing opium trade, and have assisted the Chinese in their efforts to escape from the thralldom of the opium habit. Such are some of the great and many blessings which Christianity has already conferred upon China and its people.

Among the agencies for the spread of its doctrines may be mentioned the daily preaching in the Street Chapels, which are kept open the greater part of each day for any passer-by to enter, and where the preaching and the singing are mainly conducted by Chinese Evangelists; the Services in the ordinary Churches and Chapels; the elementary boys' and girls' schools for the children of the poorer classes; the higher schools and colleges for Christians and non-Christians; the work of the Medical Missionaries and Nurses in the Hospitals and Dispensaries, in which religious services are daily held; the visits of Lady Missionaries and Bible women to the homes of the people; the extremely important pioneer work of the hundreds of Bible and Tract Colporteurs, who, when visiting towns and villages to sell portions of the Scriptures and other religious books, frequently take the opportunity of explaining their meaning; the distribution

of Christian literature especially adapted for the gentry and literati; the institution of Museums, which seem remarkably adapted to attract the interest of the educated classes;—and, lastly, but not least, the influences of Christian, saintly, and self-sacrificing lives quietly lived in their midst.

SOME STATISTICS.

In the year 1906, as before stated, there were approximately 3,750 Foreign Protestant Missionaries residing in China. Of these, 1,950 were British, 1,457 American, and some 343 Continental and Independent Workers.

The number of Bible Women:—In 1876, 90; in 1889, 180; in 1906, 894.

Number of Boys' and Girls' Day Schools:—In 1878, 289; in 1906, 385.

Number of Scholars in Day Schools:—In 1876, 4,909; in 1889, 16,836; in 1906, 42,546.

Number of Intermediate, High Schools and Colleges:—In 1906, 389.

Number of Students in Colleges, etc. (male and female):—In 1906, 15,137.

Total number of Scholars and Students:—In 1906, 57,683.

By the commencement of 1908 it is estimated that the total number of Foreign Protestant Missionaries in China will be at least 4,000. The number of Mission Stations (including the sub or smaller ones) is about 5,750. The ordained Chinese Pastors and other Chinese Preachers are now about 6,000. The number of recognised Protestant Church (full) Members and Catechumens is estimated as 250,000, which, with the addition of children and others not regarded as in full connection, represents a total of about 1,000,000 persons who are more or less closely connected with the Protestant Christian Churches of China.

The number of Hospitals and Dispensaries under the care of the Missionary Societies are—Hospitals, 166; Dispensaries, 241; and upwards of 1,000,000 out and in-patients were recipients of medical relief and care during the year 1905. The current expenses of the Hospitals (exclusive of the medical missionary's salary) are often covered by the receipts from paying patients, the sale of medicines, and by native contributions.

The number of copies and portions of the Holy Scriptures issued in China during the year 1905 is as follows:—

The British and Foreign Bible Society ...	1,219,048	copies
The National Bible Society of Scotland	907,274	"
The American Bible Society	537,304	"

Or a grand total of ... 2,663,626 "

The number of tracts and publications distributed in China in the year 1905 is as follows:—

Central China Tract Society	2,567,524	copies
The Chinese Tract Society	340,120	"
The North China Tract Society, average	500,000	"
North Fukien Tract Society (Foochow)	130,086	"
Hongkong and Canton Tract Society ...	40,045	"
The West China Tract Society	130,000	"

Or a grand total of ... 3,707,775 "

In addition to these particulars it must be borne in mind that the missions have about nine or ten important printing establishments which annually send out a vast volume of Christian literature, and which employ many hundreds of artisans. The Christian Literature Society alone has, in one year, published over 37 million pages of useful literature.

The blind in China are estimated at about 500,000; this calculation is based on one in 600 of the population, which is taken as at 300,000,000. This estimate represents the proportion of blind people in England, but as the ravages of smallpox and ophthalmia in China are greatly in excess of these diseases in England, the above number may be taken as a very incomplete statement of the real facts.

There are 12 institutions for the blind in China maintained by the Presbyterian Church of U.S.A. (North), the Church Missionary Society, the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, the English Presbyterian Church, the Hildersheim Mission and Mr. Murray's Mission for the Blind at Peking.

The deaf and dumb are estimated by Mrs. Mills, who has established at Chefoo the only school in China for those thus afflicted, at about 400,000.

The population of China, including the Provinces in Manchuria and Mongolia, is stated, according to the Statesman's Year Book (1907), to be 426 millions.

In 1812 a census, such as it was, was taken, which gave the population as 362 millions. The Chinese customs report for 1881 gives it as 380 millions, and Dr. Timothy Richard is of opinion that the present population is about 400 millions.

In conversations that Mr. Fox had with H.M. Consul at Hankow, Mr. Fraser, who has devoted much thought and study to this subject, Mr. Fraser informed Mr. Fox that the population in China was greatly exaggerated in the figures put forward by the government, as he was of the opinion that an estimate of 200 millions was probably about the actual number. Dr. J. C. Gibson, of Swatow, thinks that 250 millions would probably be more correct.

But if we take a mean between the extreme estimates of 200 and 400 millions, and estimate the population as at 300 millions, we shall probably be not very far from the actual number.

We must bear in mind that as a rule we only travel through the most fertile parts of China, and that we thus naturally see the most densely peopled country, but do not see the very large tracts of land which are very sparsely inhabited.

POSSIBILITY OF EVANGELISATION OF CHINA.

To make any statement as to how or when it may be possible to evangelise the Empire of China may seem to partake in some degree of presumption, and, at any rate, to be fraught with uncertainty, as the problem is necessarily so surrounded with conditions and circumstances which cannot be estimated or foreseen, and as, after all, the spread of Christian truth must ever be largely dependent upon how far the means adopted and the labours of its exponents are in harmony with the Spirit of the Master, and the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit; but it has been suggested that in order to evangelise China, in any sense, and to supply her Evangelical churches with Chinese pastors, one Chinese ordained pastor would be necessary to supply a locality or district containing a population of 7,500, that is to say, reckoning at the same time the labours of elders, deacons, and other Christian workers connected with each pastorate.

Assuming the population of the Chinese Empire to be 300,000,000, as we have conjectured, this would mean that some 40,000 Chinese pastors would be required, or, say, about 34,000 in addition to the existing number of 6,000 ordained and unordained pastors and workers.

If, therefore, the missionary societies resolve, if possible, to work up during the next ten years to this ideal of 34,000 pastors, this would imply that the task or duty that will lie before each missionary in China during this period of ten years would be to endeavour to train, or to enlist with a view to training, on an average one Chinese pastor each year, or ten pastors in ten years.

ADMINISTRATION OF CHINA.

China, for purposes of administration, is divided into twenty-two provinces, including the eighteen provinces with which we are more or less familiar, and the three provinces of Manchuria—Heilungkiang, Kirin and Fengtien—as well as the province of Chinese Turkestan.

The Central Government may be described as a patriarchal despotism.

Broadly speaking, each province is supposed to be divided into ten prefectures, and each prefecture is sub-divided into ten sub-prefectures or districts.

Thus in a province where such divisions prevail there would be 100 sub-prefectures. Each of these districts would be presided over by a magistrate.

The unit of Chinese administrative life is the family or clan.

The members of a family clan are often so numerous as to comprise all the inhabitants of a village or small town.

The family clan, or the village, is controlled and practically ruled by an elder, who is periodically elected by the whole community to fill that office.

The Government officials hold the elders responsible for the good order of the villages and their family clans.

Whilst the Emperor and his Ministers at Peking are supposed to have despotic powers and to be supreme, yet the provincial administrative powers of the local officials and gentry are such as practically to establish throughout China a democratic form of Government, and, within certain limits, the people of China appear to enjoy much greater liberty than those of most other countries.

THE LANGUAGE SPOKEN AND WRITTEN.

The dialects or languages of the Chinese Empire are very numerous and dissimilar. Thus a Chinese speaking the dialect of the Kwangtung (Canton) Province is not understood by a Chinese residing in the neighbouring province of Fukien. The language or dialect spoken at Shanghai would be quite strange to the people residing at Peking.

The written characters of Chinese are, however, understood and recognised by sight throughout the whole Empire in the same manner as our Arabic numerals, 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., are recognised by the eye throughout Europe; but as these numerals, when pronounced or read have entirely different sounds attached to them in England, France, Germany, Italy, etc., so the Chinese written characters are spoken in totally different words and sounds in the several provinces of China, with, however, the important exception that the Mandarin language is spoken or understood, more or less, throughout three-fourths of China, or, roughly speaking, in nearly all the provinces north and west of the river Yangtze.

The language known as Wen-li is the medium by which the classical books of China have been handed down. It is *par excellence* the written language of China, but is not generally understood by the great mass of the people. The spoken language, viz., Mandarin, may also be written, and there is a good deal of colloquial literature in Mandarin. Versions of the Bible in the local *patois* have also been produced in several districts of the South-east, where the dialects are very numerous and diverse.

In the Chinese written language there are over 40,000 distinct characters or symbols, and this vast number is being constantly

increased by the addition of new characters to represent new scientific words and modern ideas.

Although the Chinese are considered a literary people and have naturally a desire for education, yet, owing to the extreme difficulty of mastering the Chinese characters, it is estimated that only one in ten of the population can read or write.

Missionaries find that their Christian converts experience much difficulty in learning to read the Scriptures in the Chinese characters.

ROMANISED FORM OF CHINESE CHARACTERS.

In consequence of this difficulty, missionaries in various parts of China, but more especially in the provinces of the south of China, have devised a system of writing a representation of the Chinese characters by words printed in the Roman alphabet, or in the system generally known as the Romanised form, the requisite tones being indicated by an arrangement of dots over particular words.

By the agency of this Romanised system the converts, especially those of more advanced years, can now learn to read the Scriptures in the relatively brief period of three or four months, and those persons who found it difficult, or almost impossible, to read the Chinese characters can now read the Romanised editions of the Scriptures with comparative ease.

This system also offers increased facilities for learning to write, and converts who are debarred from corresponding with their friends in Chinese characters are now enabled to do so in the Romanised.

In many districts where Mandarin is spoken, and in others where the various colloquial dialects are current, it is customary, we were given to understand, for missionaries to teach their scholars to read and write in the Chinese characters as well as in the Romanised system.

RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF MISSIONARY WORK IN CHINA.*

So far as we have been in a position to learn, from opinions expressed in conversation with experienced missionaries and in other ways when in China, it would seem to be important:—

1.—That a foremost consideration be given to the questions of efficiency, concentration, the strengthening of existing agencies, and the pressing need for co-operation and federation in work between different societies.

2.—That the missionary societies in the Homelands should, in the future, regard the securing of highly cultivated and specially qualified persons as of greater importance than a rapid increase in the numbers of their missionary staff.

*Two or three of these recommendations are suggested in the Memorial to the Home Churches issued by the Shanghai Conference.

3.—That there should be a considerable addition to the number of medical missionaries and trained nurses, of men and women possessing special educational and literary qualifications, and lady missionaries to work amongst the Chinese women.

4.—That the attention of the missionary societies should be drawn to the following resolution of the Shanghai Conference, in view of the fact that the Christian objection to ancestral worship, as at present practised by the Chinese people, presents one of the greatest obstacles to the spread of Christianity:—

“ That while the worship of ancestors is incompatible with an enlightened and spiritual conception of the Christian Church, yet we should be careful to encourage in our Christian converts the feeling of reverence for the memory of the departed which this custom seeks to express, and to impress upon the Chinese in general the fact that Christians attach great importance to filial piety.

“ That the Conference recommends our Chinese brethren to encourage an affectionate remembrance of the dead by beautifying graves, and erecting useful memorials to parents and ancestors by building or endowing churches, schools, hospitals, asylums, and other charitable institutions, as is common in all Christian lands, thus making memorials of the departed a means of helping the living through successive generations.

5.—That the training of native pastors, teachers, evangelists, and others, as well as the general supervision of the work and organisation of the churches, should continue to claim the time and attention of the missionaries, whilst the more direct work of evangelisation should devolve, as far as possible, upon the Chinese Christian workers, who appear to be better qualified in some respects for this special department of service.

6.—That a change in the present methods of conducting the secretarial and other departments of business in connection with the several societies should be carefully considered. The business operations in connection with missionary work engross, we understand, in too many cases, a large amount of the time and thought of the more experienced missionaries in China. It is thought provision should, as far as possible, be made for the appointment of laymen to attend to such duties. This trifling change in the methods of organisation would be the means of effecting considerable saving in the time and energies of the more valuable missionary representatives, and would relieve them of the pressure of business details which now so frequently distract their minds and divert their attention from other more pressing claims of mission work.

7.—That in view of the widespread and extremely strong consensus of opinion which we found to exist in favour of the policy

that every mission station, or at any rate every station of a head-quarter or central character should be supplied with an efficient medical hospital and dispensary, run on the most approved lines and equipped with the most modern medical appliances, and that in no case should there be less than two duly qualified medical missionaries attached to each hospital, we would strongly commend the adoption of these suggestions on the part of the home societies.

Also that the secretaries of the various societies should despatch definite and precise instructions to their representatives in China that in no case should a hospital be closed owing to the summer vacation, but that the medical staff and the nurses should arrange to take their very needful rest and holiday in alternate months.

We attach much importance to such instructions being despatched, and the consequent necessary arrangements in the reorganisation of the staff or otherwise being promptly made by the home authorities, as complaints are frequent as to the way the home societies are acting in this matter.

8.—That to each hospital should be appointed two trained foreign nurses whose time and energies should be mainly devoted to the teaching and training of Chinese nurses.

This seems to be an important department of mission work at present largely neglected or overlooked by the home authorities.

9.—That as a practical manifestation of the influence and fruit of the Christian faith, the home societies should keep in view, whenever and wherever possible, the establishment of schools for the blind, the deaf and dumb, and homes and hospitals for orphans, foundlings, the insane, and lepers, looking to the co-operation of philanthropic native gentlemen, who are often most willing to assist in such matters.

10.—That great efforts should be made to start and improve colleges and schools, since missionaries find that as soon as a few converts are raised up and formed into a church, it is necessary to establish elementary schools to train and teach the children of the converts, and even the converts themselves, and that these elementary schools have soon to be supplemented by higher and secondary schools, and these in turn by divinity or theological colleges for the training of pastors and teachers; and, as a result of the wonderful awakening of the Chinese Government and people, missionaries are now realising that in order that the influence of Christianity may be extended, it is highly desirable to establish colleges in which the English language and Western science can be taught, and which may be thrown open alike to Christians and non-Christians.

Hence, during recent years, great efforts have been made in the educational department of missionary work, by British as well as by American societies, to develop a higher and more comprehensive system of education; but it would seem, partly owing, no doubt, to

greater financial support by their people at home, that the American societies have made greater progress than those of Great Britain, as witness their very excellent and complete colleges at Peking, Tungchow and Wuchang, and St. John's College at Shanghai. It should, however, be mentioned that the British societies have some excellent colleges, but these colleges should be increased in numbers and improved.

11.—That special attention be devoted to the education and training of girls, the future mothers of the Chinese people, and that at all the principal mission stations schools for girls should be started.

12.—That the missionary societies, acting upon the express desire of their representatives in China, should co-operate together in sending out to China able and properly qualified Christian men and women to reside in each of the provincial capitals of the 22 provinces of China, and whose duty should consist mainly in the endeavour to influence and to instruct in the principles of Christianity and the Christian faith the literary and official classes, by the agency of personal intercourse; by the distribution of Christian literature of such a description as would commend itself to these influential people; by delivering lectures on Western subjects; and by carrying out, on an enlarged basis, the important missionary work already so efficiently and usefully initiated by the Christian Literature Society at Shanghai.

13.—That the attention of the Home Committees be called to the increase in the cost of living in the Far East, particularly in the Treaty Ports, and that in consequence they be asked to consider the readjustment of the salaries of Chinese employees in centres where the sums paid have become inadequate to secure efficiency; also that they relieve missionaries, where stipends are paid in sterling, of any anxiety which may be caused by variations in exchange.

14.—That the Directors and Committees of the various missionary societies, in order to effect a considerable financial saving, and at the same time to increase the efficiency of their mission work, should consider in what ways they may avail themselves of the interesting and instructive departures in union work which the missionary societies have recently initiated in the Peking and Amoy districts. In order that federal action in these special departments of Mission work may with advantage be carried out in China, it is most desirable that the home societies should organise some means of common intercourse and action.

Would it not be possible that some forms of Missionary work, such as the spread of Christianity among the higher and more educated classes of China, medical, hospital, and nursing establishments, the many departments of higher education, Bible and Tract Colportage and distribution, and the Young Men's and Women's Christian Asso-

ciations, might in future be carried on by a union of the missionary societies in China?

15.—That, in view of a widespread desire which seems to exist, the several missionary societies in England and America should act together in establishing colleges or a university in each of the provincial capitals, or at any rate in many of the more important centres of influence. One group of missionaries advocate the founding of a university, upon the lines of that at Oxford or Cambridge, at a central locality such as Peking or Hankow or Wuchang; whilst another group would prefer that colleges or universities, upon the lines of the London or Manchester University, should be established at centres like Shanghai, Hankow or Wuchang, Hongkong, Swatow or Amoy, Peking, Tientsin, and Chentu, so that colleges and buildings, where such already exist in those places, may be utilised and thus the great expense of erecting an entirely new set of buildings be obviated.

At the present time the only college authorised by the Imperial Government to grant medical degrees is the Medical College of the Peking Union Hospital; but it is hoped that ultimately the Imperial Government will be willing to grant a similar concession to the other colleges and universities under the management of the missionary societies.

16.—That it is highly advisable that the Chairman or Vice-Chairman, with one of the officials of each society, should make a point of periodically paying a visit to its mission stations in China.

In conclusion, we were delighted to hear of the remarkable moral awakening, and the strenuous efforts which the Chinese authorities and people are making, in every part of the Empire, to rescue themselves and their country from the degrading and demoralising evils that the practice of opium smoking had inflicted upon them.

FRANCIS WM. FOX.

ALEXANDER MACALISTER.

ALEXANDER R. SIMPSON.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

DELUSIONS OR STORM CLOUDS?

ONLY a prophet could set the right value upon current social and political facts according as they occur and assign to them their right places in a nation's history. For what at the outset appeared to have the least is often seen at the end to possess the greatest measure of vitality and significance. Moreover a small spark may cause a vast conflagration. The death of a public worker, the crime of a common assassin, the word of an influential statesman may be fraught with far resonant consequences which elude the gaze of the annalist and are not fully grasped until the advent of the historian. Take but a trivial instance in contemporary history. I well remember the sharp criticism with which an article of mine was assailed by Russian Liberals three years ago solely because I ventured to denote the events of the historic 21st January as the opening of the Revolution. Since then, however, the designation has been accepted, although the movement is now seen to have been a revolution produced by the clashing, not of mighty forces but of unparalleled feeblenesses—a duel between the paralytic and the epileptic. Passing in review those events or incidents of which the daily life of a nation is made up, one sometimes feels like the ancient Greek who, when he asked the strange vendor what kind of a house he was offering for sale, was shown two of the bricks and told to judge for himself.

Casting one's eye over the various "storm clouds," little and big, roseate and black, which political writers descry in the firmament at any given moment, one might profitably jot down such a forecast of each as the circumstances seemingly warrant, and then, after the lapse of fifteen, ten or even five years, read them over again and try to recall to mind the conditions that gave rise to those pessimistic anticipations. How many people foresaw that the leasing of Kiao Chow by Germany implied the Russo-Japanese campaign, or that King Victor Emmanuel's refusal to accept the part of *postillon d'amour* in arranging an interview between Kaiser Wilhelm II. and President

Loubet would give rise to the Morocco Question in its acute form, and seriously endanger the peace of the world? Hardly five. And what is more, this political shortsightedness matters but little nowadays, when policies before they can be adopted by a Minister have to be sure of the approval of a public assembly. The statesman who should have proclaimed, when Kiao Chow was leased, that Japan would soon drive Russia from the Pacific, would have been treated by his countrymen as Cassandra was dealt with by her Trojans.

The auspices under which the new year began are understood to be quite favourable on the whole:—Resolutions of the Peace Conference, pacific assurances of the German Emperor, Anglo-Russian, Russo-Japanese and various other international agreements cheered the lover of international order and peace. But the Zodiacal signs of the Millennium were not visible at dawn of the new year, while the inevitable storm-cloud or its shadow was clearly discernible; and its forms are many. There is the Morocco Question which, despite the hopeful anticipations of political writers who considered it as good as settled soon after General Drude had appeared on the scene, is growing weekly more intense and more suggestive of the Serbonian Bog to which I ventured to liken it. Then there is the Persian tinder which is smouldering and smoking, and in spite of elaborate precautions may any day burst into flame. Side by side with that is the Turco-Persian-German tangle which, like the knot tied by the Phrygian King, may ultimately have to be cut with the sword. And last in order, but far from least in importance, the so-called "racial" difficulty, which we shall henceforth ever have with us as one of the enduring characteristics of latter-day civilisation, if it has not become more acute, has at least produced such tangible effects as the sailing of the great American Armada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and a high and unhealthy degree of excitement consequent upon that.

Are all these veritable storm-clouds, or only one, or none? Who can say?

GREAT BRITAIN AND GERMANY.

There is, however, another token of impending danger which to my thinking at least is more pressing than any of those enumerated above, because it concerns the British nation directly and affects the British community vitally. I confess I mention it with the utmost hesitation, knowing how reluctant our people now are—and rightly are—to say or do aught which might adversely affect the amicable intercourse which is at present being cultivated by Germany and Great Britain between themselves. But it is a duty. Personally, there is nothing I desire more ardently than the definite burial of the

hatchet by John Bull and Vetter Michel. This act, more effectually than ten folio volumes of Hague Conference resolutions, would ensure peace on the European continent, and probably on the earth generally as well. It would certainly put an end to the ruinous war in peace, which consists in the never-ending race for military and naval supremacy and is perpetuating misery among hard-working populations; it would date a fresh epoch and mark a new stage of human progress. And for these reasons I would strongly advise our people to consent even to serious sacrifices in order to attain this desirable end. But if this happy consummation is not drawing nigh, if there be no signs of it coming, if it be beyond our reach altogether, then it would be treason in him who discerns or believes that he discerns this to deny or disguise it for fear of ruffling the temper of his readers. And that is precisely my case. Yielding to none in my respect for German culture, present as well as past, I cannot blink the perspective that a needless and baleful conflict between the two nations is unavoidable despite the positive unwillingness of our entire people to get embroiled with any Power, and more especially with Germany, and despite the equally pronounced distaste of a portion of the German people to provoke the enmity of Great Britain. Thanks to the protracted sojourn of the Kaiser in these islands, to the fascinating charm of his manner, and to the credible assurances of his personal goodwill, the feelings of the two kindred peoples towards each other are apparently marked by greater cordiality to-day than at any time during the past twenty years. And that is an advantage. But even during his Majesty's stay in England, and almost at the moment he was being applauded for his pacific Guildhall oration, the Navy Bill was made known.

That Navy Bill is a misfortune to this country and the world, it laughs to scorn every serious endeavour made to curtail armaments since Nicholas II. issued his Eirenicon in 1898, and it renders further efforts in this direction hopeless for the present. For never before had Germany stronger inducements to cut down her naval expenses or less reason to increase them than to-day.

GERMANY WILL NOT ALLOW US TO REDUCE OUR NAVAL EXPENDITURE.

We must resign ourselves to increased and ever-increasing taxation. About this money tribute to the Moloch of war there will be henceforth no finality. His cry, like that of the horseleech's two daughters, will be "give, give!" Germany and Britain will keep on outbidding each other in naval efficiency. Mr. Haldane in a remarkable speech has declared that he must take leave to doubt whether in face of German and American competition England would be able to maintain her absolute maritime supremacy upon the basis of a two Power standard for even as much as another ten years to come; and there is unhappily no reason to call this statement in question. According to Colonel Gaedke's calculations, which are admittedly

deserving of credence, the German navy will in 1915 be more powerful than any other, with the sole exception of the British, and to this it will be then almost equal.

GOOD EXAMPLE OF THE GERMAN NAVY LEAGUE.

From the crisis in the German Navy League no falling off in the demands of the Kaiser's Government or in the grant of the nation is to be anticipated. For the cause of the conflict has nothing whatever to do with the aims and objects of the League, it is but a political difference of opinion turning on the circumstance that the Bavarians and other South Germans being Catholics, whereas the Prussians are Protestants, the Navy League, which needs the co-operation of all parties, ought not to indulge in the political game, and yet is doing this. Some time ago, General Keim being a candidate for the Presidency of the League, the Bavarian members took alarm because he is the man who agitated with such energy and virulence against the Catholic party at the recent general elections. This conduct of General Keim was not only unwise, it was a violation of the by-laws of the League. In consequence of the General's political views and attitude the Bavarians and other South Germans were strongly opposed to his standing, and they made this point clear. Further, the Chancellor informed the President of the League, Prince Salm, that if M. Keim were elected President the Bavarian branch of the League would be dissolved and its protector, Prince Rupprecht of Bavaria, would resign. In spite of this notification the restless General was duly raised to the apex of the great naval pyramid and the conflict broke out; at first one reigning prince, then another quitted the League, and now at the eleventh hour, the influence of Prince Heinrich and of the Kaiser himself is being used to patch up the quarrel.

The very *raison d'être* of the Navy League is, or at any rate ought to be, an object lesson to Englishmen—in patriotism and politics. The society had its origin in the circumstance that Germany being devoid of a vast seaboard it was no easy task to arouse a sufficiently warm interest among landlubbers in the work of creating a set of floating fortresses, to impel them to furnish the money to pay for the navy. One can well imagine the open-mouthed astonishment of the farmer or farm labourer from Mecklenburg when he first heard of German line-of-battle ships, and was told that he might feel such a pride in them as would warrant his paying an additional sum every year for their upkeep. Well, the Navy League undertook to fire such unpromising human materials as these with enthusiasm for the great German Navy. And it succeeded. Peripatetic spread-eagle orators were sent from place to place to deliver popular lectures, to give

magic lantern representations, to call meetings, to found branches of the League, and to arrange for weekly, monthly, yearly excursions to the north where the untrained rustic was taken on board one or other of the great armoured ships and told of the wonders which it could work for him and his like. Tens of thousands of these honest, hardworking hewers of wood and drawers of water would be conveyed every year to Heligoland or Wilhelmshaven to witness the navy manoeuvres. Many of them are said to have been better able—thanks to lectures and leaflets—to classify the warships that passed before their eyes, than the North Sea fishermen who spent their lives on the ocean waves. It is impossible not to admire the sense of duty, the sentiment of patriotism and the selflessness underlying both, which are disclosed to us by the marvellous success that attended the efforts of the Navy League, and by the prodigious sums of money voluntarily paid by the German people for a navy which in the hands of ambitious ministers may yet lead Germany and Great Britain into very troubled waters.

SPAIN AND RUSSIA MOVE WITH THE TIMES.

Every nation of standing and world-political strivings is *volens* following the example set by Germany. It is Hobson's choice. If you strive for the end you must use the means. There was, however, something pathetic in the sudden exertions of Spain to keep abreast of the times: Spain, whose one endeavour ought to be thrift, self-education, internal reconstruction. But the deputies, carried away by their feelings, went to the extent of promising more than the mountaineers of the Pyrennees, the Gallego husbandmen and the Castilian Don who never beheld the sea were likely to perform. And shortly afterwards they were obliged to retract pitifully. Russia, too, is in the running, although no time in all her history was less propitious than the present. For if the necessary money were available, the needful men are not; and if trustworthy crews could be found and plenty of money were forthcoming to pay for the construction of ships for them, it is certain that much of the funds would stick to the pockets of the officials, while the remainder would be spent upon shells which a storm would upset or a long sea voyage disable. That is the line of argument which the ex-leader of the Extreme Right, M. Purishkevich, has announced his intention to rely upon when the debates on the navy vote begin. That politician will demand the sweeping away of the Admiralty as it now stands, and the appointment of new men, young, active, honest, to

the vacated places. Apparently a modest request. Apparently. So, too, was the demand made by the French reformer who asked only for the suppression of all knaves and scoundrels. But besides honest naval officials and trustworthy crews Russia lacks money. She has not enough even for those reforms which are pressing and indispensable, for railways, for rolling stock, for waterways, for educational purposes, for agricultural improvements. It is instructive to compare her navy, as it still exists, with that of Germany from the point of view of high and well-paid officials. The German navy is two-and-three-quarter times greater than the Russian (459,000 tons represent Germany's first-class battleships as against 172,000 tons belonging to Russia). Yet the number of naval generals and admirals in the Tsardom is 110, whereas in Germany it is only 26. The staff officers number 651 to 612, while higher officers are as 1,164 to 907. According to the standard adopted in the Kaiser's navy Russia should have:—

10 naval generals and admirals instead of 110	
219 staff officers in lieu of	651
324 higher officers in place of	1,164.

JAPAN'S INCOME AND OUTLAY.

Japan, too, is tottering under the financial burdens imposed by the necessity of being ever ready to strike at a moment's notice. Five years back Nippon's national accounts were balanced with about 250 million yen, whereas this year the total of 616 millions has been reached. To meet this relatively enormous expenditure is the Herculean task which the Mikado's Government must accomplish if Japan is to hold her own among the solvent nations of the earth. How difficult of solution this problem is, even with the wonderful self-denial of the people as an auxiliary, may be gathered from the statistics published by a Japanese Review which comes out three times a month.* First of all the foreign debt of the Empire is about two milliards, two hundred and fifty million yen, and the interest on this sum is an exhausting drain on the slender resources of the industrious and thrifty population.

With a budget of 616 million yen, every subject of the Mikado, man, woman and child, is responsible for 12.61 yen. If we group the population, as is generally done, in families, and reckon an average of five persons to the family, the burden would amount to 63 yen, or if we put it in a more concrete form, we may say that the wealth-

*The *Togo Kaisaw*.

creating inhabitant pays over twenty per cent of his earnings to the State, or about 4s. 1d. in the pound. Now that is not merely a heavy tax, but a pernicious one. Competent authorities in political economy affirm that when the tax exceeds ten per cent, or 2s. in the pound, it becomes positively harmful to the entire community. There is, of course, another way of looking at the question, and it is occasionally chosen by supporters of the Japanese Government. They say to their fellow citizens: "Look at European countries. They are far more heavily taxed than you. The French pay 37.80 yen,* the Austrians 34.41, the British 32.18, the Italians 28.46, the Germans 19.68, the Americans 14.09, whereas we give but 12.61 yen annually to the State. And that is quite true, so far as it goes, but it is only a half truth, of which the other half is this: The average income of the Japanese wealth-creator is very much less than that of Europeans and Americans. The average American income is 440 yen, the British yearly income is about 360 yen, the Frenchman earns 312, the German 247, the Austrian 167, the Italian 140, and the Jap only 60 yen. That is where the shoe pinches. For if we ask what percentage of their earnings these people part with to their respective Governments the answer is: the Yankee gives only 3.2 per cent, the German 7.9, the Briton 8.9, the Frenchman 12.2, the Italian 20.3, the Austrian 20.6, and the Jap 21 per cent. Lastly, if we cast a glance at the price of an hour's labour paid to the members of the different nations we find the following instructive table of comparisons:† 33.52 sen‡ is earned by the Yankee, 20.38 by the Briton, 19.30 by the Frenchman, 15.94 by the German, and only 6 by the Jap.

CONDITION OF THE HUMAN PILLARS OF THE EMPIRE OF NIPPON.

There is no people in the world, therefore, who are as heavily mulcted for national purposes as the subjects of the Mikado. The tax-producing machine in Nippon is become an instrument of torture. From time to time bitter complaints are made in the Press; strikes have grown frequent in industrial establishments; banks have suspended payment. And to make matters worse, the cost of living in Japan, as in Russia, has risen enormously during the past two years, and will certainly rise still more as soon as the remainder of the foreign loans have been taken up in Europe and America. And then? Already the price of the staple food, rice, has gone up one

* A yen is worth about two shillings and a halfpenny.

† These tables were compiled in the United States in 1903.

‡ A sen is the one-hundredth part of a yen.

hundred per cent. during the past twelvemonth. The pinch of poverty which the late war is causing the Japanese to feel so painfully is being likewise, and perhaps to a similar extent, experienced by the Russian people, who continue to lead lives which ought to be impossible to civilised beings in the twentieth century of the Christian era.

No wonder the Japanese people, stung by misery and ground down by taxes, should seek abroad surcease of sorrow and higher wages, and no wonder their thrift, sobriety, application to work and few wants should enable them to compete successfully with the European and American in most walks of life. Hence the stream of immigration to California and to Canada which has given rise to a problem with which humanity for ages to come may have to reckon. Racial it is not. For Japanese in Great Britain or France are neither treated nor regarded as racially obnoxious or inferior to the people in whose midst they reside. They are looked upon as equals unless they show inferiority. But in California, in Australia, in Canada, the relations between the Jap and the European colonist are tinged with hatred, but it is not primarily race hatred. If the immigrant came to spend instead of earn, he would be received very differently. It is because he contributes to lower the standard of living, to lessen the workman's wage, to make the "white" man's position precarious, that the racial question is smuggled into the discussion as a means of rendering him odious. "Why should we white men be set on the same level as these "Indians, Japs and other Orientals, who can live for a week on the "memories of a day's full meal? people ask. "Why should we "consent to earn less in order that these intruders may get a foothold "in the place and use it to drive us out?"

THE ASIATIC PROBLEM.

The problem is one of life and death—a veritable Sphinx question—to those most nearly concerned. For no race, however inferior it may really be, will consent to famish slowly in order that other people may fatten and take their ease, especially if it has a good chance to make a fight for life. Has not the wasp as good a right to exist as the bee, the tiger as the zebra? And say what we may, Orientals, or the Orientals who are now in question, viz., the Japs or the Hindoos—are by no means inferior peoples. They happen to be formidable competitors and successful trade rivals, and are likely to beat the "white" man in the struggle. That is the essence of the matter. Therefore the venue has been changed: instead of the field of commerce, the sphere of diplomacy has been chosen for the struggle. The next transfer—if there be one—may carry the combatants to the battlefield.

The keenness of the commercial and industrial fight now going on between Japs and "white men" may be gathered from the bitter complaints uttered by so many of the latter of late. Take for instance the ocean carrying trade. The P. and O. Steamship Co. had long possessed a considerable share of the trade between Bombay and Japan. But Sir Thomas Sutherland, presiding over the annual meeting of that Company last December, complained that "the whole of the Company's inter-colonial trade between Bombay and Japan had been for the present wiped out by their Japanese competitors. He imagined that the Japanese Companies were being forced by their Government to increase their sailings from Bombay to such an extent that Japan had left the P. and O. Company out in the cold. Up to this year the latter had been able to obtain a share of that trade, but the present increase of competition was hardly fair, seeing that during the war between Russia and Japan the Company carried on the whole of that business for the benefit of the Japanese manufacturing interests." Ingratitude, therefore, is the single count in the indictment against our allies. Can Sir Thomas Sutherland have forgotten the hard fact pithily stated by that compellant authority Satan: "All that a man hath will he give for his life," including sentimentality?

The decisive factor in the situation, however, is the subsidising by the Japanese Government of the Japanese shipping, and the difficulty—in some cases the impossibility—for private companies to compete with a Government. It appears that for every steamer of 1,000 and more tons displacement about sixpence a ton is paid by the Ministry for every thousand miles covered. The British Government refuses to imitate the Government of Nippon, and doubtless for excellent reasons, as a Japanese diplomatist recently observed. And there the matter rests. Gratitude for past favours, which were probably also matters of business, cannot be reasonably demanded of a people engaged in a desperate fight for bare existence. Rice and water before the manifestation of gratitude. Even if Count Okuma had uttered all the strange sayings attributed to him by the Kobe journals—and why did they unanimously saddle him with them if there were no grounds for doing so?—one need not affect extreme surprise. Count Okuma is not a member of the Tokio Government. He is not any longer the leader of a party. Hence he would have been guilty of no offence even if he had told his Kobe hearers—as he is alleged to have done—to go to India and trade there. He denies that he used the words: "Being oppressed by Europeans, the 300 million people of India are looking for Japanese protection. They have commenced to boycott European merchandise. If, therefore, the Japanese let the chance slip by and do not go to India, the Indians will be disappointed. If one will not take gifts from Heaven,

"Heaven may send one misfortune." And his denial is enough. Nothing however in the alleged words is false, except the oppression of the Indian population by "Europeans," and oppression is a word of many meanings. If Count Okuma did not actually utter these words, I should be surprised to learn that he did not think them, and not he only but most of his old colleagues and present political adversaries in Tokio, Kobe and elsewhere. Nothing could be more natural, more patriotic and more human. At the moment when the Japanese are being ignominiously expelled from America and from parts of the British Empire, can they be reasonably expected not to cast longing eyes towards India, where there undoubtedly is a feeling of sympathy for them were it only because Hindoos are also being expelled from British Colonies as second-class subjects of his Majesty? *Honi soit qui mal y pense.*

The plain fact is that the struggle for life is growing keener, more refined and more cruel as time goes on and civilisation progresses. We ourselves are contributing to render it so, by warning the "inferior" races off our commercial and industrial preserves. And as we sow we shall reap. Would it be fair, one may ask, if they managed to retaliate in kind? Should we expostulate with them as Sir Thos. Sutherland expostulated with the Japs? In this connection I would venture to make an interesting little prediction which some five or six years will suffice to confirm or belie. I foresee clearly an attempt—perhaps a successful attempt—on the part of Japan to warn the "superior" races of the globe off Korea, China and other extensive districts of the Far East, with their own consent, when the time comes to renew and modify the commercial treaties which are now in force between herself and other nations. Japan's deep-seated conviction is that she possesses a perfect right to grant a set of special privileges to her next door neighbours, because they are her next door neighbours, in return for analogous favours from them in which it shall not be open for Britain, France, the United States or Germany to participate in virtue of the most favoured nation treatment. What that may mean even the average statesman who "fails to discern any danger in the facts alleged" will readily understand. But is it a crime, is it "unfair," is it even as exclusive and egotistic as the recent plans of Europeans in the Far East?

It is alleged that the Japanese are competing with us to some good purpose in shipbuilding, because here again their Government assists them with subsidies. Thus they are building war vessels not only for their own navy but for those of China and Siam. They are also hard at work cotton spinning, and although they have not yet overtaken the Briton in this, they are making good headway. Unhappily, it is added, they let their women and children help them,

and are in no hurry to bring in a factory law for the protection of these defenceless members of the community. If true, that, of course, is reprehensible. But we should not forget that it was just as bad in Russia a few years back, and that people are still living who can recall how terrible the conditions of child labour were in England before factory legislation began. In all these complaints against the Jap there are jarring notes. The keynote of the situation is this: all Asia is awakening to a sense of its rights and of its wrongs, and to consciousness of its might and of other nation's weak points. And the Japanese are the natural leaders of the new movement, which is to the full as respectable, as just and as likely to succeed as was any of the non-religious movements which mark epochs in European progress. For Europe in general and for Great Britain in particular this impending upheaval is fraught with danger of the gravest kind. But danger lurks everywhere, and nowhere is it quite identical with disaster. Careful statesmanship may work wonders, especially in a contest with adversaries who have their own difficulties to contend with.

The way in which the differences between the United States and Nippon are now being smoothed over offers an example of the kind of compromise which for a while at all events it may be possible to effect. The State of California demands the passing of a Japanese Exclusion Bill, which would arouse the indignation of the whole Japanese nation. In the hope of obviating this the Tokio Cabinet very wisely opened negotiations with the American Ambassador, and agreed to restrict immigration to the United States by refusing to deliver passports to its own subjects. With similar wisdom Japan tore up the Treaty of Shimonoseki and bowed to the wishes of Russia, Germany and France. The American representative objected that the Tokio authorities had already—according to their own account—made strenuous attempts to limit immigration but failed. And they had failed because Japanese citizens who received a pass, say to Mexico, first duly went thither, but subsequently immigrated to America. Hence more effectual measures would now have to be taken by the Japanese Government. As soon as these precautions are made known to the Government of the United States the misunderstanding between the two nations will be considered at an end, for the time being, and the Japanese Exclusion Bill will in all probability not become law. However this may be, there is no temerity in the assertion that war between the Yankees and the Japs—the war about which the Yellow Press has written so graphically in connection with the sailing of the American armada for the Pacific—is not within the pale of practical politics. Neither country is prepared for war, neither country has justification enough

for war, neither State has anything to gain by hostilities which could not be obtained by negotiations. For that reason the war scare may be safely disregarded. But the moral responsibility of those who printed the reports of an impending war and industriously spread them throughout the globe is heavy.

THE PERSIAN PROBLEM: REVOLUTION OR DEGENERATION?

Another form of the Asiatic difficulty now become acute is known as the Persian. And yet the Iranians or Persians, like the Indians, are men of our own Indo-Celtic stock—the stock from which Greeks and Romans, Slavs and Saxons, Hindoos and Celts have sprung. They have certainly changed very considerably since Cyrus defeating Croesus fulfilled an equivocal oracle. Mohammedanism and Oriental despotism, fatalism and crass ignorance are among the disintegrating influences which have altered their character since Darius raised Zoroastrianism to the dignity of a State religion. It usually requires a long time and the operation of potent forces to change sensibly the character of a homogeneous people; but that such a change is possible in historic times is amply demonstrated by the woeful example of the Iranian race.

The troubles that now break the sameness of Persian political life have been dignified with the name of revolution. But the historian will probably reject it as a misnomer and conclude from the symptoms to decomposition in the political organism and to degeneration of the race. And that is what one would naturally expect. For few people have been so long subjected to a succession of such brutal despots as the Persians, who are correctly described as law-abiding, timorous, reserved and cunning. Nowhere do we find traces among them of that ferocious cruelty the repulsive manifestations of which stain the pages of the French and Russian revolutions. Insurrections, risings, skirmishes have indeed been confidently foretold in Teheran, Tabreez and elsewhere, but they do not seem to have come to pass. *Cà se dit mais ça ne se fait pas chez nous*. True, Persia is an extensive realm, and communications between the two extremities are defective, and that perhaps is one of the many reasons why there has been no real revolution; possibly another is because the people lack faith or are devoid of fighting qualities. Anyhow the circumstance that they wrested a Constitution from the dynasty proves but little, for their success was due chiefly to the fact that the Shah, Muzaffer-ed-din, was a will-less, pitiful creature on whom lay the shadow of death. Long before that he had sold his patrimony to Russia for a mess of pottage, incurring the odium of his impotent

subjects; and afterwards, when Russia was defeated by Japan, it became an easy matter to wring a paper Constitution from the dying monarch, who stood confronted by a whole nation of malcontents directed by secret societies and headed by the powerful clergy. Every man's hand was against him and he became as plastic as potter's clay. It was then that noisy meetings, solemn processions, fiery discourses prepared the mind of the masses for the sanguinary revolution which never broke out—meetings of 10,000 persons like that at which eloquent Mullahs preached open insurrection and then fled to the gardens of the British Embassy for sanctuary. But there was no bloodshed; no madness like that of the Russians, which aroused horror among men.

A MUCH SWEARING MONARCH AND A PROTEAN CONSTITUTION.

The Constitution was signed by the Shah on the first day of the New Year, 1907, exactly one week before his physical death. His son and successor, Mohammed Ali, an autocrat by nature, naturally yearned for a return to the good old order of things which would authorise him to do what he pleased. Accordingly he hated the Constitution, and swore to observe it faithfully, and cast about for ways and means of abolishing it with impunity. The defunct statesman, Amin-es-Sultan, was the one wonder-worker who could have enabled him to achieve this feat, and for that reason he had been slain by the revolutionists. The shiftless Mohammed Ali never before felt his loss so painfully. At the grave of Emin's murderer nearly 100,000 persons appeared in October in order to take part in a manifestation against the King of Kings. They had been summoned by the secret societies, the name of which is legion, and they undoubtedly succeeded in intimidating the Shah. But no blood was spilled.

The only result attained by the clumsy devices of Mohammed Ali has been to put himself in the disagreeable necessity of taking three several oaths to do his duty as Constitutional monarch. And even after the third his loyal subjects had their misgivings. Last October the Constitution was altered considerably, and he was obliged to swear an oath to respect that, and—Mohammedan that he professes to be—he undertook solemnly to treat all religious denominations as equal in the eyes of the State. Other Constitutions may be drafted later on, each one more radical than the foregoing. But whatever provisions they may contain, Shah Mohammed Ali is sure to swear fidelity to them all. *Téhéran vaut bien un serment.* For he

stands alone. Nobody is willing to break a lance in his cause; no party will espouse it even for a day.

Revolution and counter-revolution in Iran smack of the musical comedy; Gilbert and Sullivan would have been in their element dealing with it. It is made up of big words, theatrical gestures, a few score shots, some assassinations and thousands of threats. Shah and Parliament fall out several times a month, threaten each other with imprisonment and dethronement respectively, then appoint a clearing house day, and wind up the transaction by expressing their feelings of mutual admiration and esteem in the flowery language of Hafiz and Omar Khayyam. Then a few days pass, after which the adherents of the reaction and the friends of Persian freedom, resolved to try issues once more, pitch their tents on the public squares, issue proclamations, fulminate excommunications and at last take up their tents and go in peace. And Shah Mohammed Ali rules in a similar spirit. To-day he appoints ministers and predicts halcyon days for his people, to-morrow he arrests the ministers as traitors and curses the halcyons. The day after he releases his prisoners. Thus in December his Majesty caused his Premier, Nasr-el-Mulk, to be taken into custody and thrown into prison, but the British *chargé d'affaires* is understood to have put pressure upon the King of Kings and to have obtained the release of Nasr, a graduate of Oxford, who was then escorted to a place of safety beyond the Persian frontiers.

Thereupon the Shah authorised his ex-Prime Minister and ex-prisoner to reside if he wished in the capital. Nasr-el-Mulk is an enlightened Constitutionalist, whose offence was that he declined to retain office while his royal master was intriguing with outspoken enemies of the Constitution for the purpose of withdrawing the reforms that had been conceded. It appears that some time previously the Shah had given orders that an anti-Parliamentary party should be founded under the name Endjumen Futuvat. And the royal behest was duly executed. The members, who are among the *élite* of Iran, number about 200, and have seven leaders. The latter one day had an audience of the ruler and asked his leave to carry out a *coup d'état* against the Parliament. "I should like nothing better," replied the Shah, "but" One of the chiefs—Emir Bihadur—is said to have then explained that he had had several chats in the dead of the night with the Russian Minister, Hartwig, on the subject, and that they had talked to good purpose. Bihadur next proposed that the chief of the Cossack brigade, who is a Russian officer, should be graciously allowed to bombard the Medjliss with artillery for the good of the nation. And for several days running the Cossack artillery riveted the attention of timid citizens in the streets of Teheran, but did no harm. For before the hour

struck when harm would have been done—say the Constitutionalists—Nasr-el-Mulk and his colleagues sent the Minister of the Interior to tell the ruler that unless he desisted they would resign in a body. The Shah's party replied that they would be glad to fill up the vacant ministerial posts with their own members. The monarch would also have been glad to give them the opportunity, and that is why he had Nasr-el-Mulk seized; but the Cossacks—well, the Cossacks behaved like broken reeds.

PERSIAN COSSACKS AND THEIR DOINGS.

The story about the Russian Minister, M. Hartwig, is obviously an invention, which even if were not authoritatively contradicted would be summarily rejected by all those who have any knowledge of things and persons in Persia. M. Hartwig is incapable of weaving plots with Emir Bihadur or any other son of Iran. So far as I have been able to ascertain the facts they are as follows. On the night of the 19th December his Majesty, trusting in the selfless loyalty of his devoted Cossacks, ordered them to bombard the Parliament and attack its defenders. It was an audacious and an unwise act. Audacious because it meant the setting of the Shah's life on a single cast of the die, and unwise because it attributed to the Cossacks qualities in which they were wholly deficient.

The Persian Cossacks of to-day are show-troops, good for a holiday parade or to escort the body of a defunct statesman to the tomb, but quite useless in the battlefield. The brigade was formed in 1878 by Nasr-ed-din-Shah. He had asked in Europe for a number of officers to help him to create an efficient little army, and he received them at Vienna. But Russia insisted in having a finger in the military pie, and was allowed to form the nucleus of a Persian Army. The chief instructor was Colonel Demantovich, a clever organiser, who did all that was expected of him, drew up Russian rules for his Persian men, dressed them like Caucasian Cossacks, and when he received four heavy guns from Alexander III., and four more from Nicholas II., formed an artillery battery. No money was spared to make the officers comfortable, so long as they had their first commander, for the Shah felt they were a sort of Pretorian Guards for his protection. For that reason he favoured the notion that they were independent of the Russian Minister at Teheran; but in time the Minister asserted his authority at the expense of that of the King of Kings. After that the Cossacks vegetated. They gave up drill and other military occupations and were supposed to be bitterly hostile to the "revolution" and ready to do the will of the Russian Minister plenipotentiary. He was their only master. After Russia's defeat in the Far East the "Cossacks" became an anomaly. Their

commander had departed, leaving a deficit of seventy-five thousand roubles, and the men now consisted of Turco-Tartar foot soldiers and artillerists who are really devoted to the liberal and anti-dynastic movement. And it was in the loyalty of these revolutionists that the sorely-pressed Shah-in Shah put his trust! The present Commander of the Cossacks besought the ruler not to issue the bombardment order against the Parliament because it would not be carried out; the Cossacks would mutiny. That is why the scheme hung fire.

HUNGRY PENSIONERS AND AN IMPECUNIOUS PARLIAMENT.

The parties in Iran are numerous, and, on the whole, badly led. They are sections of a rabble, rather than groups of serious politicians. Most of the members' speeches might be termed "high falutin'"; many of their ideas are visionary. As in Russia, the Parliament lacks men of light and leading. One of the demagogues who has attracted a greater share of attention than his colleagues is Taghi-Sadeh. This deputy, who comes from Tabreez, where democracy is rampant, can always interest and often excite his hearers. He is an industrious student of the French Revolution. One day, addressing the House of Justice, he said among much else: "Even as it behoves us effectively to shield the body of his Majesty the Shah from criminal outrages, in like manner it is our bounden duty to protect his royal mind from the influence of those counsellors who attune it to the bane of the nation. It has fallen to our lot to remove these stumbling blocks from the path of the Ministers that so they may work unhindered." One can well imagine the Shah's feelings towards Taghi-Sadeh.

In Persia everybody's path seems to be barred by stumbling blocks, which are as numerous as pebbles on the beach. Impecuniosity is the source of a sea of troubles: there is no money for any purpose, good or evil, and the reason is to be sought in the foolish obstinacy of the deputies who refused to authorise a foreign loan. The Shah's embarrassment is extreme. Despite his gorgeous jewels, he has not the wherewithal to pay his personal expenses. For as the Medjliss refused to accept money from the *giaour*, the Shah scorned to touch the beggarly pittance of £100,000 which the legislative assembly allowed him on condition that it was to be inclusive, and that there were to be no extras. Having spurned the inadequate allowance, he let loose his dependents against the Parliament, and the result was worthy of the pen of the author of *Truthful James*. Penniless muleteers, impecunious officers, bureaucrats in straightened circumstances and a mighty host of pensioners, all of whose supplies

had been stopped, came to expostulate, quarrel, or fight with the friends of the House of Justice.

The venerable widows of the late Shah Nasr-ed-din were in a particularly evil plight. These ex-queens marched in a compact body to the palace of the deputies—and although, to the eye of the observer, they formed quite a little army, their numbers had been greatly reduced by death. Their conduct in the assembly was exemplary. They drafted a petition which contained the most painful admission a Persian lady can make: they confessed that they were grown old and grey-haired, and besought the "sacred assembly" to continue to have their pensions paid them. And their relatives in the House also pleaded their cause with becoming warmth. "In Europe, see how the widowed consorts of monarchs are treated," exclaimed Prince Mirza. "Yes, indeed," retorted the irrepressible Taghi-Sadeh, who has an answer or an epigrammatic comment for everything. "Yes, indeed. But did it never occur to you to reflect that in Europe among States whose budgets amount to thousands of millions of krans the monarch has only one wife; whereas in little Persia, with an insignificant revenue, we have to fee and pension dozens of consorts and their quickly-increasing progeny?" Disrespectful deputies also mentioned certain princes who were rich enough to support their aged stepmothers, or suggested that the indigent old dowager queens should sell or pawn their jewels instead of begging alms from the needy peasants. Altogether it was a scene which Brigham Young could have thoroughly appreciated.

The doings of the Medjliss, the shilly-shallying of the Shah, the indignation of a whole host of hungry pensioners who play their parts in a farcical ceremony with the gravity of chief justices, may dispose the foreigner to mirth. But it is no laughing matter to the Persian nation, whose day of judgment seems to have come, and whose public men must feel like Shakespeare's Cassius when he said:

"The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings."

Material want, misery, hunger are among the evils with which the Persian man and woman will now have to grapple. The few who are capable of turning their thoughts from the individual to the nation, from the present to the future, will find little in the perspective to cheer or to console them. Iran as a political community has had its long day of glory and prosperity—a day when there were no Russian or British interests clashing in the Middle East, no Bagdad Railway Scheme in course of realisation, no rulers base enough to sell their subjects as well as themselves, and none of the numerous and costly demands which modern civilisation makes upon every independent political State. As things are to-day, the utmost that Persia

may look forward to in the near future is the restoration of order, the resumption of humdrum life, and the establishment of conditions favourable to the growth of material well-being. Meanwhile to Persians "the past and to come seems best; things present, worst."

A NEW MOORISH SULTAN FOR THE OLD: MULEY HAFID SUPERSEDES ABDUL AZIZ.

Morocco, viewed from the banks of the Seine, is becoming more and more like the Serbonian Bog to which I once compared it. No sooner does a sorely pressed French Government imagine that it has touched bottom in this or that Moorish difficulty, than the quicksand gives way, and the sinking process recommences. There is no finality anywhere. Millions of francs and hundreds or thousands of soldiers may have to be sacrificed before normal conditions are established in the land, and the outlook for trade and commerce bettered. If the statesmen of the Wilhelmstrasse were not impermeable to that unworthy sentiment which is known everywhere by its German name of *Schadenfreude*, what exquisite thrills of delight the recent news from Morocco would have given them! There are now two Sultans in lieu of one, and the royal hostage on whom M. Pichon fancied he was keeping a firm hold has been suddenly changed into thin air.

In October, 1907, I described Muley Hafid, the reigning monarch's brother and rival, as a Sultan *in partibus infidelium*. He has now been proclaimed the legitimate ruler of the land by the clergy, the Kadis of Fez and the notables, and generally by those elements of the population who, acting in combination, possess the right of deposing one monarch and setting up another. From the Moorish point of view, these classes did their duty by their tribe and their country. Abdul Aziz they describe as a woman in man's clothing, and point to the harem, not to the battlefield or the council chamber, as his proper sphere. His brother, on the contrary, is a king indeed. Muley Hafid's youth has been full of glorious adventures, his conduct marked by foolhardy fearlessness, his dealings with his companions were invariably characterised by frankness, and the impression which he has made upon friend and foe is that of whole-heartedness. And in diplomacy he was as ready and as brilliant as in the field. To the advisers of his royal brother the splendid reputation of this enterprising prince appeared dangerous. Like so many of the chief ministers or Grand Viziers in old Eastern legend, they counselled the monarch to put him out of harm's way behind the bolts and bars of a prison. And as Abdul Aziz followed the advice, Muley Hafid widened the range of his experience in confinement, and at

last he became an ideal candidate for the throne. Therefore his subjects did well to raise him to it.

That, however, is the Moorish point of view.

PROGRAMME AND MISSION OF THE NEW RULER.

In October Muley was in Marakesh, where he had previously been Governor, and his countrymen there chose him as Sultan of the Holy War. A correspondent of the *Matin* thereupon sought him out, and received his autumnal profession of faith. It was briefly this: "We are not minded to quarrel with Europe, but only to withstand a policy which has plunged our country in anarchy and brought us to the verge of ruin. We might aptly be likened to a great family whose business and interests were looked after by one of the members, whose management, however, resulted in loss. The large family has now decided to take the administration of its affairs from his hands, and to entrust another member with the task of putting things right, paying off debts, and restoring to the legacy the size and shape it had when bequeathed to us by our father. Does this mode of action stamp us as revolutionists or ambitious schemers? Do you not, Frenchmen, depose your kings; do you not still overturn your Governments? You think of Abdul Aziz even as we do; you deem him feeble and incompetent? And your estimate is correct. He has entangled the affairs of the country, he has incurred debts which he cannot wipe out, he has wasted money on trash, he lives for his pleasures only, and is surrounded by intriguers to whose evil promptings he lends a willing ear. . . . Of all these things France is well aware, for when she seized Ujda and Casablanca she sent no intimation to Abdul Aziz, well knowing his impotency and incompetence."

Those were wise words. "Yes," exclaimed French diplomatists at the time, "the words are the words of Muley, but the brain is the brain of Bülow." Perhaps that is so. But as yet we cannot say whether the vernal programme of Muley the Sultan *in partibus infidelium* will be identical with the autumnal programme of Muley the legitimate ruler of Morocco. The pity of it is that France's work among the ill-starred Moors and other tribes cannot now be given up without an unbearable loss of prestige nor pursued without a ruinous sacrifice of money and men. One issue out of the difficulty there is, the same that existed at the outset, and will, it is ardently hoped in Berlin, be accepted before the end: Germany is quite ready to give France a perfectly free hand in Morocco—provided that the statesmen of the Quai d'Orsay recognise Codlin as the friend, not Short. Let

Germany's friendship take the place of England, and everything else becomes plain sailing.

HOW ABDUL'S DETHRONEMENT AFFECTS FRANCE.

How grave the situation is become which to French politicians appeared so reassuring a few short weeks ago, may be gathered from the letter in which Abdul Aziz has been apprised of his dethronement by the Ulemas, the Pashas, the Kadis and the notables who decreed it. That document is a brief indictment of the ex-Sultan, and among the counts are included a sinfully close alliance with Christianity and Christians (how those Moors calumniate M. M. Clemenceau and Pichon!) and a criminal cession of Moorish territory to the French. The new Sultan is bidden to do away with the State Bank, to get back from France the Oasis of Tuat and Sahara, to rid the nation of French troops, and to cancel the Algeçiras Agreement. The Moors undoubtedly mean business, and the Republic must resign itself to sink more gold in the Serbonian Bog.

But why should not France await developments philosophically?—one may ask. First of all, because she may not have the chance of doing so. Hitherto Spain, whose duties, so far as the policing of the ports goes, are identical with those of the Republic, has been prudently or guilefully holding back. The French acted in the spirit, the Spaniards in the letter of the Algeçiras arrangement. Why the Ministers at Madrid adopted this line of action is a secondary question; for France the important point was to induce them to abandon it. And to effect this was probably the main object of M. Pichon's visit to Madrid. He was on the point of succeeding when Abdul Aziz was deposed, and now, like Sisyphus, when his marble block has rolled down to the bottom of the hill, he must begin the work all over again.

Suppose, however, that a waiting policy were possible, would it be also profitable? Could the Government of the Republic postpone indefinitely the question: Who is now the Sultan of Morocco, and which of the two brothers is the Pretender? Surely not. It must make a choice between Abdul Aziz and Muley Hafid. If the latter, what attitude can M. Pichon decently take up respecting the mission entrusted to the new Sultan, the retrocession of Moorish territory, the abrogation of the Algeçiras act, the dissolution of the State Bank? He will have got out of the frying-pan into the fire. And how will he recover the sums lent by the Republic to Abdul Aziz, or get the agreements observed which were struck up by this ruler and the Government of the Republic? On the other hand, if Abdul

Aziz' claims are upheld by the Republic—and considering that he is residing in Rabat virtually under French protection, they ought to be—the ill-starred ruler may well ask for what purpose heavy guns have been brought to Morocco if his cause, which is that of France, is not to be furthered by them? “My friendship for the Great Republic has brought me to this plight, what will the great Republic now do for me?” If M. Pichon can metamorphose a puppet into a king, create Moorish troops to fight the king's battles and help the native army without provoking a Holy War, he would do well to stand by his protégé, Abdul Aziz. But as he cannot work miracles, in all probability cool calculations will prompt him and his colleagues to leave the two royal brothers to fight the matter out, and to keep their powder dry for the victor.

E. J. DILLON.

THE BRITISH ARMY OF THE PRESENT DAY.

This article, by Major von Heydebreck, of the German army, is taken from an official report issued by the German General Staff.

WHEN we consider the successive phases of organisation and tactics through which the British Army has passed during the last ten years, we must bear in mind that before that time the principal object of its existence was the defence of the Colonies. The changes in the political situation which have since taken place have rendered it necessary to provide for a possible conflict with a European power. On the South African veld the British Army learned the bitter lesson that methods suitable for savage warfare are useless against marksmen armed with modern weapons, and that the most devoted courage and the most dashing assaults are of no avail against the leaden hail of the magazine rifle. Accordingly the British proceeded to modify their tactical methods, and to adopt those recognised as sound in the South African War. At the same time they set about re-organising their army so as to provide for more rapidly putting a large force into line in a country beyond the seas. More than one Minister for War has attempted this task, which is rendered a difficult one by the peculiar conditions prevailing in Great Britain. In the meantime the Manchurian War took place, and its lessons were not lost sight of. No army has been at greater pains than the English army to utilise the information gained in that campaign. And we may now say that this period of development has produced a definite result.

Mr. Haldane, the present able and energetic Minister for War, has now given the army an organisation which will make it a serviceable weapon under whatever conditions it may have to be used. This organisation will provide for the safety of England, so far as this is possible without resorting to compulsory service. This the nation is not at present prepared to accept, although their leading soldiers are vigorously agitating in its favour. Conscription is just

and necessary only when it is a question of defending the country against invasion. But what nation is strong enough to land in Great Britain such an army as would be required to subdue this highly-developed, proud and stout-hearted people? A small force would be useless for such an undertaking. What nation—or rather, what combination of nations—has a fleet powerful enough to prepare the way for this invasion, and to guard the line of communication oversea against the countless armoured squadrons of the United Kingdom, which have never before been so fully prepared for war?

As it has been in the past, so in the future a voluntarily recruited army will form the basis of the British land forces. But national requirements now necessitate an extension of the duties of the army. Henceforth its task will be to defend the country, to take part in a Continental war and to protect the Colonies.

In order fully to understand Mr. Haldane's great work, it is necessary to refer briefly to the scheme of his immediate predecessor, Mr. Arnold Forster.

The South African War had set the English authorities a heavier task than they anticipated. At that time the Home army, which was the principal force available for use against the Boers, was little more than a collection of depots. It was quite incapable of undertaking operations on a large scale. For the battalions, on the average, required a draft of 700 men to complete their war strength of 1,008 rifles. The cavalry were short of horses; many regiments had only one horse to two men. Brigades and larger tactical units existed only on paper. There was no combined training. Even the training of the units was confined to drill, since no manœuvre grounds (in the modern sense of the term) were available.

To bring the army up to war strength on mobilisation, every reservist in the country was called up; and the reserve was soon exhausted. It was then necessary to enlist a large number of recruits; these were of course useless until trained.

This mobilisation taught the country two lessons. First, the army must have in peace-time the organisation in which it will fight in war, and this organisation must be such as to facilitate training and to expedite mobilisation. Secondly, the term of service must be such as to provide a more abundant supply of reservists than in 1899, when the men served seven years with the colours and five in the reserve.

As regards the first point, Mr. Brodrick, who had come into office as the result of the events in South Africa, naturally looked to the great Continental Powers for a model for his system. He accordingly created the Army Corps as the tactical unit for the British army, and he proposed to divide the army into four army corps, each of three divisions. But only the First Army Corps, stationed at Aldershot, was to consist entirely of regular troops; the remainder

were to be partly regular divisions, partly divisions of auxiliary troops; and the latter had still to be created. An alternative proposal was that the divisions themselves should consist partly of regular battalions and partly of auxiliaries. But the force of regular troops serving at home was insufficient to fill up the proposed framework.

As regards the second point, Mr. Brodrick introduced a long term of service in the reserve, namely nine years, and a term of three years only with the colours. This system would certainly, in the course of time, have produced a strong reserve. But the difficulty of finding drafts for the Colonies soon made itself felt. The conditions required by the double purpose which the British army was now called upon to serve proved difficult to reconcile. The authorities wished to have a strong Home army, capable of taking a part, on occasion, in Continental warfare. This necessitated a strong reserve, corresponding to a short term of colour-service. But, on the other hand, a very considerable force of long-service men is required to defend the Colonies, and such a force cannot produce a strong reserve. Mr. Brodrick hoped that a sufficient number of three years' men would extend their service, but in this he was disappointed.

In 1903 Mr. Arnold Forster, formerly a litterateur, became Minister for War. He had vigorously opposed his predecessor's scheme, both in Parliament and in the Press. The principal object of his own scheme was to provide a sufficient number of recruits for the long-service army required by the Colonies. In July, 1904, he brought out his Army Reform Scheme, which, in the meantime, had been slightly modified. This scheme was considerably altered before it passed. But we will here consider the original scheme as submitted to Parliament, since it gives a good idea of the difficulties in the way of army reform in England.

The scheme began with a declaration that the Government had no intention of introducing compulsory service. They considered the army projected by Mr. Brodrick to be unnecessarily large for the national requirements. For it would always remain the duty of the navy to protect the country against invasion on a large scale; the principal duty of the army was to protect the Colonies against internal and external foes. At the most the army might have to repel raids upon the United Kingdom during the temporary absence of the fleet. Therefore it was permissible to reduce the strength both of the regular and the auxiliary forces.

Mr. Arnold Forster proposed to reduce the regular infantry from 172,714 to 162,153, or by about 10,000 men. This was to be effected not by reducing battalions, but by reducing establishments, except in the case of battalions in India. In fact, he proposed to increase the number of battalions from 171 to 185. The term "army corps" was to be abolished, since, as he pointed out, his predecessor's army

corps existed only on paper. They were to be replaced by so-called Commands, each under a General Officer Commanding-in-Chief. We may here remark, in anticipation, that in January, 1905, Great Britain was divided into seven Commands, besides the (independent) London District. Within these Commands the regular troops were organised in nine divisions; certain units were directly under the General Officer Commanding, or under the Coast Defence Commanders. Mr. Arnold Forster further proposed to keep a strong division of 16,000 men at Aldershot ready to embark at once for foreign service.

But the most important feature of his scheme was the alteration of the periods of colour-service, made with the object of providing the necessary drafts of long-service men for the Colonies and, at the same time producing a strong reserve for the Home army. Mr. Arnold Forster decided to introduce a double system of enlistment. Some men were to enlist for two years with the colours and six in the reserve, and others for nine years with the colours and three in the reserve. He hoped to attract the necessary number of long-service men by giving them a small increase of pay from the outset; also, they were to have the prospect of employment as instructors at home after nine years of service abroad. The army would thus be divided into two separate branches, the General Service Army (long service) and the Home Service Army (short service). The latter was always to be stationed at home, except in war time, and could not be ordered abroad except on grave national emergency.

It is unnecessary to go into the minor details of the scheme; but we may note that it proposed to create reserve officers, in the German sense of the term. Each battalion of the Home army was to have ten reserve officers, who were to serve one year with the colours, and then to join the reserve, and to attend training with the reservists of their battalion. It is also noteworthy that Mr. Arnold Forster proposed to increase the period of Militia training from three to six months, and also to increase the period of field training in the Volunteers.

Mr. Arnold Forster's scheme was, from the first, regarded with disfavour both by the army and by the general public. The weakest point of the scheme was its failure to ensure a sufficient supply of men for the Colonies, while the Home army had a surplus of recruits. This became so manifest, and the interests of the Colonies were obviously so important, that the short service system was abolished for infantry as early as October of the same year, and the conditions of service were fixed at nine years with the colours and three with the reserve for the whole of the infantry. This change was shortly afterwards extended to the cavalry and to the garrison artillery. But this was clearly unsound, since the short period of three years in the reserve could not possibly provide a sufficient number of reservists.

And one of the principal lessons of the Boer War had been the absolute necessity for a large reserve of trained soldiers in the event of a European war, or of a great Colonial war. In South Africa the reservists had formed the backbone of the army.

An article to the above effect appeared in the *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW* for December, 1904, and was written by a member of the Opposition, Mr. Charles Hobhouse. This article also condemned Mr. Arnold Forster's "striking force" of 16,000 men as too weak for a serious campaign, and too strong for an ordinary Colonial expedition. The writer of the article then bitterly denounced the reduction of the Militia and Volunteers. These forces are traditionally sacred in England, and it is a dangerous experiment for any Government to meddle with them.

The spirit in which the scheme was received by the army is illustrated by an article in the "*Standard*," January, 1905, by a "General with forty years service." This officer blamed the attitude of the Army Council (another creation of Mr. Arnold Forster's). He considered it incredible that a council consisting principally of officers could have approved of a scheme to reduce the army and to divide it into a Home and a Colonial force. The General also held that the reduction of the auxiliary forces was utterly unjustifiable. For even, if it were true, as stated by another military writer, that the Militia was "a mass of half-trained youths with badly-trained officers," this was a reason for improving their training, not for reducing their numbers. Any intelligent person could understand that a reduction of the national forces must weaken the nation for defence and endanger its safety. In conclusion, the writer of the article pointed out that the duties which would have to be performed by the army were even then not fully understood. The authorities consoled themselves by repeating that the Boer War was at last brought to a successful issue, in spite of the unprepared state of the army. This was a fatal error. For the British had only achieved success, after a year of fighting, by the overwhelming superiority of their numbers. A war waged with untrained troops against a powerful Continental army could only end in disaster. Modern armies could not be improvised. The recruits that England in her hour of need had hastily collected for South Africa were for the most part valueless. The writer quoted a letter from a general commanding a division in South Africa: "If this is the best we can do to avert a great danger, then may God help England. Where are we to get the men for a great European war?" Where, indeed, echoed the writer of the article, unless by cutting off our supply of men to the Colonies?

The question of the Reserves and of the Colonial drafts was more acute than ever, when the change of Government, in 1905, brought Mr. Haldane to his present difficult post. During his last months

of office Mr. Arnold Forster had again changed the terms of enlistment, reverting to the double system as originally intended. Accordingly Mr. Haldane found the army organised as follows:—

1. The Regular Army, consisting of one army corps of three divisions (Aldershot) and six independent divisions, also four cavalry brigades, total 100,000 men. But some of these units existed only on paper in peace time, which materially increased the difficulty of mobilisation. Moreover, the regular army, as above explained, could not muster a sufficient number of reservists to bring the units up to war strength, because the term of service in the reserve was too short. It should be noted that a large proportion of the men who pass into the reserve are unfit for active service, because their health has been undermined by long service in the tropics.

2. The Volunteer or Auxiliary Army, consisting of the Yeomanry (25,000 mounted men) and the Volunteers (240,000 unmounted men). The organisation, training, and system of recruiting differed materially in the different units. There were no tactical units larger than the battalion. The auxiliary forces had neither artillery nor transport, and their training was utterly insufficient, so that they were of little value in a regular campaign.

Mr. Haldane soon came to the conclusion that reform must not be restricted as hitherto to the regular army, but must include the auxiliary forces. Since it was impossible to interfere with the system of paid and voluntary recruiting, the next best thing was to take the auxiliary troops in hand, and to make them as efficient as possible. Their dormant capabilities were to be aroused, and they were to be made efficient auxiliaries to the regular forces. But the difficulty lay in combining this reform with the economy in military expenditure which formed part of the programme of the Liberal Government.

For the reasons stated above, Mr. Haldane directed his efforts towards establishing, in peace time, all the military formations which would be required in war. As will be remembered, this had never previously been done in England. All previous projects of reform had left a quarter or a less proportion of the staffs, units, ammunition and supply columns and train to be formed on mobilisation. The outbreak of the Boer War showed to what an extent this policy of unreadiness had been carried.

Mr Haldane's project further embraced:—

1. A suitable re-organisation and strengthening of the regular mobile field army.
2. The provision, without fail, of a strong reserve and of second line formations, to reinforce the army in the event of war.
3. Serviceable organisation and better training of the auxiliary troops.

In re-organising his army Mr. Haldane no doubt looked to Japan for a model. In his opinion, the army corps was too large a unit

for the small English army and for oversea undertakings, while the division, as then existing, was incomplete in organisation and too weak in numbers to be employed independently. He resolved to organise the army in six strong independent divisions. He provided each division with heavy field artillery, namely, one gun battery and two howitzer batteries. Thus the division now consists of twelve battalions in three brigades, two squadrons, and twelve batteries (including three of heavy artillery), and is stronger by four battalions, one squadron and six batteries than it was before. The four cavalry brigades are to be combined into one large division, which may if necessary be split up into two smaller divisions. There are two new mounted brigades, each consisting of mounted infantry with some cavalry and artillery. These are to give greater freedom of movement to the cavalry division in its task of strategical reconnaissance, since these mounted brigades will undertake the duties of the cavalry screen. Since the whole of the regular cavalry is absorbed in the above formations, the two divisional squadrons with each division will consist of yeomanry.

The technical troops, the ammunition and supply columns and the train have been considerably increased. Each division has now two field companies R.E. instead of one, besides a telegraph company. Besides these, the headquarters of the army is to have six telegraph companies, of which two are equipped with wireless installations. Indirect units are well provided with telephone equipment. It will be noticed how thoroughly the lessons of the Manchurian campaign have been applied. Formerly, when the army was intended principally for service in the Colonies, it was less completely provided with ammunition columns and train. Since it was now intended to equip the army for service in Europe, the greater part of these columns, etc., had to be raised as new formations.

These reforms have raised the strength of the regular field army to a war establishment of 166,000 men, instead of 120,000 as formerly. The regular reserve is insufficient to complete this total, for its strength, taking the most sanguine estimate, does not exceed 80,000 men. This number could not suffice to complete even the small field army projected in earlier schemes. For the number of reservists required on mobilisation is far larger than would appear from the peace establishments. From these must be deducted at least 20 per cent. of boys too young for service in the field. Besides these, the Home army has always a large percentage of untrained men, because the home battalions have constantly to supply drafts for the Colonies, which are replaced by recruits. The men returning from service in the tropics are certainly unfit to proceed on active service immediately.

Mr. Haldane here grasped the possibility of making a portion of the auxiliary troops available to assist the regular army. He assigned

to the former Militia the duty of strengthening the regular reserve. Thus the Militia have been converted into the Special Army Reserve, or Special Contingent; on the outbreak of war they are to supply the extra reservists required to complete the regular army, and they are further to find the drafts required to make good casualties during the campaign. The total period of service in the Special Contingent is six years, out of which the men have to do six months' training in the first year, and fourteen days in each of the five following years. This short period of training is not calculated to produce men capable of performing all the duties required of a soldier in the field. Accordingly these Special Reservists are intended principally for non-combatant duties with the field army. On mobilisation the whole of them are to join the colours at once, and it is hoped that there will then be time to complete their training. This force is far more efficient than the former Militia, in that it is at once available for service abroad, whereas the Militia were only enlisted for home service. The training of the infantry of the Special Contingent is to be carried out in specially-established depots by instructors (officers and men) taken from the regular army. As regards the artillery, the 33 batteries in excess of the strength of the field army (66 batteries) are to be formed into instructional batteries for the artillery of the reserve. The cavalry require no special reserve, since their peace strength is already greater than that required for the field army, namely 192 men per squadron as against 160 required on mobilisation.

The part of Mr. Haldane's Bill dealing with the Special Contingent was not carried without strong opposition. He had originally intended to dissolve the Militia altogether, and to re-enlist it for his Special Contingent. But tradition, which is a mighty force in England, was too strong for him. The House of Lords sent back the Bill and insisted on the retention of the Militia. Accordingly, the Militia have been taken over by the new army and have been embodied in it as the third and fourth battalions of their regiments. But this amendment has made no radical change in Mr. Haldane's scheme, and we may consider that he has succeeded in creating a strong reserve, immediately available, for the field army.

Simultaneously with the re-organisation of the regular troops, Mr. Haldane set about creating a Territorial Army from the existing Volunteer forces. This army, which is intended only for home defence, consists of Yeomanry and Volunteers. For the first time in their history, the Volunteers are formed into brigades and divisions corresponding to those of the regular army. The Territorial Army is to consist of fourteen infantry divisions and fourteen mounted brigades, each division and brigade complete with guns, ammunition columns, and trains. The men must engage for four years, and must attend training annually for from eight to fourteen days, or a minimum of sixteen

days for the Yeomanry. The Yeomanry squadrons detailed as Divisional Cavalry for the regular field army must train for six months the first year, and fifteen days in each following year. The territorial divisions are commanded by major-generals of the active army, and the brigade commanders are also mostly regular officers; the remainder of the officers are found by the Yeomanry and Volunteers. The territorial divisions are in peace time under the command of the generals of the commands in which they are stationed; administrative duties are performed by special officials appointed by the County Associations, which have been specially created to assist in the working of the new scheme. On mobilisation the territorial troops are to join the colours at once, and it is assumed that there will then still be time to complete their military training. Mr. Haldane even hopes that the territorial troops will be patriotic enough to volunteer for foreign service by whole divisions on a national emergency.

If it should prove that Mr. Haldane's scheme of reform, as it was projected and as it has become law, can be practically carried out in all its details, then we may safely assume that he will have done the best that it is possible to do for the British Army under the present conditions of non-compulsory enlistment. The future will show whether the English nation will back up its popular Minister for War in his scheme of re-organisation. There is no legal compulsion by which a sufficient supply of recruits can be assured; all depends upon the patriotism of individuals. This is an essential feature which has to be considered in every detail affecting the British Army. It is impossible to require as much from the men as we do on the Continent, where every man is liable to serve; and where the training is compressed into a brief period with the colours. But, on the other hand, the amount of training which we have to get through in one or two years can in England be spread over seven years.

Mr. Haldane is well aware that his new Territorial Army will demand far greater sacrifices from the patriotism of the nation than the old Volunteer force. But he hopes that the nation will be prepared to make these sacrifices. And in this he is supported by the King himself. His Majesty has publicly associated himself with Mr. Haldane's scheme—a very unusual proceeding in England. A short time ago he received the Lord Lieutenants, as Presidents of the New County Associations, with great solemnity, and informed them that he expected them to devote their best efforts to the important duties which they were called upon to perform in connection with the Territorial Army.

Even in the army few dissentient voices are now raised. Sir John French, Lord Methuen, and other leading soldiers have declared themselves in favour of the scheme, and even Lord Roberts, the

venerable President of the National Defence League, admits that the new organisation has many good points. It may be hoped, therefore, that the Government will succeed in overcoming all the difficulties in the way of the scheme. They will then have increased the armed strength of the British nation by the following reforms:—

1. The organisation of the army in the same units in peace time as in war.

2. Provision of a sufficient reserve for the regular field army. This admits of:

3. Strengthening the expeditionary force.

4. Formation of a fully-organised and suitably constituted force for the defence of the country.

* * *

To the Continental soldier, the most interesting portion of the British Army is the regular field army, because these are the troops which are intended, when necessary, to take part in a European war. We will therefore briefly consider the tactical ideas upon which their training is based, and which they will put into practice on the field of battle.

The English regular army is, from the military point of view, a good one. Since the old shock tactics broke down under the well-aimed rifle fire of the Boers, the army have energetically set themselves to profit by the lessons learnt on the bloody battlefields of South Africa. The campaign in Manchuria has been attentively followed. English officers were present at the battles, and at all the manœuvres of the great military Powers we see the English officer intent on observing, comparing and learning. And the information thus acquired is studied by the General Staff (which also, in its present form, is a creation of Mr. Haldane's), and issued to the troops. Here attention is directed every year to service musketry and to field training. Manœuvres on the large scale are now carried out in England quite as frequently as on the Continent. The latest English hand-books for the different arms, and the "Manual of Combined Training," are quite in accordance with modern military views, even if they seem to be influenced on some points by events due to quite exceptional conditions, which prevailed in the South African and Manchurian Wars. It is quite possible that the experience of those wars has occasionally been too hastily applied to the conditions which would prevail in a European theatre of war. Military readers will be able to judge of this for themselves from the description of modern English tactics given below.

The training of the army will in future be much facilitated by Mr. Haldane's system of organizing it in the units in which it will fight in war. It has been stated, with undeniable truth, that in England even the most eminent generals had no opportunity of impressing the stamp of their own personality on the troops under

their command. This is now far from being the case; we may cite as examples to the contrary the divisions under the command of Sir John French, Lord Methuen and Sir Ian Hamilton. This personal influence is not materially prejudiced by the constant stream of drafts for the Colonies, although these interfere seriously with the training of the troops.

Generally speaking, the British soldier is tough and enduring. His seven years with the colours makes him a thoroughly efficient soldier. He is willing, and is brave to the point of devotion. A glorious history and a long roll of battles in all quarters of the globe prove that he is always ready to die for the honour of the flag. Even if his discipline is on a different footing from that of the German Army, it has never failed in face of the enemy.

The officers are drawn from the upper classes of society. Healthy exercise strengthens their bodies and inures them to fatigue. The British officer has always been noted for courage and energy, as well as for a high-minded chivalry, shown rather in his actions than in his words. The countless Colonial wars waged by the English have endowed their officers with practical good sense and great adaptability to difficult circumstances; and these good qualities are shared by all ranks. The number of non-commissioned officers and soldiers in the ranks who have seen active service is a factor not to be underestimated in appraising the military value of the army. This, to some extent, atones for the ignorance of military science which is still only too prevalent among the officers. On the whole, the English officer makes a very good impression on a casual observer. The present writer attended the recent manoeuvres at Aldershot, and was on many occasions indebted to the hospitality of the English officers. He can testify to the frank cordiality with which they received him and to their genial manners.

The armament and equipment of the British regular army are fully up to the requirements of modern warfare. This applies especially to their excellent telegraph and signalling equipment, which is provided on a liberal scale.

We need, therefore, have no hesitation in pronouncing the British Army equal in quality to most Continental armies. And this is so in spite of many peculiarities in their opinions and customs, and many strange and unfamiliar tactical methods. For in England the events of the recent wars have led to conclusions different from those drawn by other armies, which latter, indeed, differ considerably among themselves. Where such divergence of opinion exists, who is to decide? In actual war tactical theories are of less consequence than their practical application.

The fighting formation of the English infantry is much the same as in Germany. It is characteristic of the English tactics that the men take extended order at an early stage of the fight, usually far

beyond the zone of effective hostile fire. Even the reserves follow in extended order. The firing lines are usually very thin, although no normal interval is prescribed. The density of the line is determined by the extent of the front, which (according to the regulations) is to be suited to the tactical conditions. In practice the front is almost always excessively wide; the reason given is that the thinner the line the smaller the target. The "Manual of Infantry Training" lays great stress on the importance of the nature of the ground, and lays it down that the best formation and method of advance is that which, in each particular case, enables the ground to be used to the best advantage. Great importance is accordingly attached to training the soldier to think and act for himself. When opening fire, the regulations lay it down that a number of rifles superior to that of the enemy is to be put in at the outset. The main fire-position is to be established as close to the enemy as possible. The regulations foresee the possibility of a fire-combat lasting many hours, and the English infantry man has therefore a large number of rounds of ammunition. He is provided altogether with 415 rounds, namely, 115 in his pouches, 100 with the heavy baggage of the battalion, 100 in the light ammunition column, and 100 in the divisional ammunition columns. Since the Boer War great attention has been devoted to "service" musketry (field practice), although the facilities for this nature of practice are inferior to those afforded to the German soldier.

It is very remarkable that little or no importance is attached to the battle of encounter, which is not even mentioned in the regulations. But the attack and defence of positions is dealt with at great length. One of the regulations relating to this matter is peculiar. Before the troops deploy for attack they are to be marched to a "position of assembly," where the division is formed up in line of brigade columns at close interval. In the attack the infantry is formed in three bodies. The first consists of the firing line, reconnoitring patrols and supports; the latter follow in line in extended order. The duty of the second body is to drive home the assault. The third body consists of about one-fourth of the attacking force, and forms the general reserve, under the control of the commander of the whole force. This general reserve is not intended to be thrown into the fight to turn the scale in favour of the assailant: it is to guard against surprises and counter-attacks, and to pursue after a successful attack. In practice the English attack is characterized by extraordinary caution. An excessively long time is spent in gaining ground, and the troops seldom get to the last stage, namely, the assault with the bayonet. This may be traced to the influence of the South African War, where the troops had to advance over bare plains against an invisible enemy. But this cautious procedure is by no means in accordance with the spirit of the English regulations, which distinctly lay it down that when

troops come into contact with the enemy they must not withdraw until a decisive result is obtained. "Combined Training," 1905, lays it down that a hesitating and over-cautious advance will, in the long run, cost as many lives as a bold and decided attack.

At the recent English manœuvres, the attack, as seen from the defender's position, presented the following features: Thin lines of skirmishers appeared here and there in the landscape, at distances of 2,000 yards and over. Sometimes several successive lines could be made out. They skilfully utilized any available cover, and afforded a very difficult target; the more so since the colour of their uniform matched natural objects. When the fire of the defence became effective, the leading skirmishers ensconced themselves under cover, and were constantly reinforced by other thin lines coming up from the rear. When the firing line was strong enough, and not before, it opened fire. From this position the further advance was made either by groups creeping forward, or by single men, or by short rushes made by large or small bodies of men. These rushes were so quick as hardly to give the defender time to avail himself of the favourable target. There was no previous indication of these rushes, neither words of command nor movements in the firing line. Where good cover was available, large bodies of men advanced in quick time or by long rushes. As soon as the leading skirmishers had arrived at such a distance that it seemed impossible to press forward further by daylight without heavy loss, they took to their spadés, and while lying down, excavated hasty cover for themselves; they waited for darkness before attempting to advance further. As soon as the light began to fail, selected men crept forward to occupy specially advantageous points closer to the enemy. When darkness fell, the main firing line advanced, aligned themselves on these men, and began to dig themselves in. Machine guns and single field guns were also brought up to this advanced position. The idea was that the defenders were to be overwhelmed with fire from the advanced position at daybreak, and that the whole force was then to deliver the assault simultaneously along the whole line. But at manœuvres this stage was rarely arrived at, because the defenders usually withdrew under cover of night.

In the defence the infantry was divided, as in the attack, into a firing line with supports, a line of reserves, and a general reserve. The regulations lay it down that only an active defence can be a successful one. Accordingly it is the duty of the reserve, composed of all arms, to counter-attack the attackers as they are advancing to the assault. At manœuvres these local counter-attacks were mostly directed against a flank of the attacking line. But the front of the attacking line was so enormous that these local counter-attacks could have had but very little effect upon the whole battle. Thus, at the recent Aldershot manœuvres, two (flagged) divisions of territorial troops, whose strength

would not have exceeded 20,000 men, took up a defensive position with a front of 12,000 yards, while the attacking line (two weak divisions) extended for 15,500 yards.

In fortifying a position, great importance is attached to dummy trenches. No doubt the Manchurian and South African Wars have shown that those are often of great use. The English also use, to deceive their adversaries, a device intermediate between dummy entrenchments and a real advanced position. This may best be described as a "sham position." It is held by cavalry and mounted infantry; machine guns and even a few field guns are allotted to it. These sham positions are occupied either in front of the main position, in order to induce the enemy to deploy prematurely, or else on the flanks of the main position, in the hope of diverting a part of the attack into a wrong direction. The British Infantry are very skilful in improvising hasty and barely visible cover.

In the training of the cavalry due importance is attached to dismounted action, which will be freely employed in future Continental wars. The English trooper has now attained considerable proficiency as a dismounted soldier. His uniform is remarkably serviceable, and at a short distance cannot be distinguished from that of the infantry man. He carries a light rifle and a liberal supply of ammunition, namely, 400 rounds, including 100 with the ammunition column of the infantry division. This enables him to take part in a battle lasting for many hours. During the first year or two after the Boer War so much stress was laid on dismounted action that the British cavalry were in danger of degenerating into mounted infantry; even if attacked by other cavalry, they would, by preference, have used their rifles. But a strong reaction has taken place in this respect, and this reaction finds expression in the "New Manual of Cavalry Training." During the recent manoeuvres several cavalry charges were delivered. The general opinion in England is that the duty of cavalry, besides reconnaissance is to deceive and annoy the enemy. They are suddenly to appear in flank or in the rear of the enemy, pour in a rapid fire, and disappear, to repeat the manoeuvre at a different point. With the same object in view they are enjoined to avail themselves of darkness to occupy a point in rear of the enemy, and to pour volleys into his unsuspecting troops at dawn. Whenever cavalry fight on foot a mounted reserve is to accompany them, to guard against a surprise. The idea of a pursuit is that the cavalry are constantly to appear along the roads by which the enemy is retreating, open rapid fire upon his columns, and by constantly annoying him, to complete his disorder. On a large scale a distinction is drawn, as in France, between reconnoitring cavalry and cavalry for the service of security. The English consider that the main body of the cavalry, which has to reconnoitre on the large scale, cannot also undertake the duties of the cavalry screen. This duty is assigned to the two newly-formed

mounted brigades, each consisting of two battalions of mounted infantry, three squadrons and a battery. The cavalry division is thus relieved of any concern about its own army, and acquires great freedom of movement. The duty of divisional cavalry will be performed by the two squadrons of yeomanry allotted to each infantry division. These mounted volunteers have only done a short period of military training. Even though they are recruited from classes of men who are accustomed to horses, it may be doubted whether they are fit for the duty required of them. They will, however, be supported to a certain extent by the mounted brigades.

The English Field Artillery are excellent troops. They are armed with a 3.3-inch field gun and a 3-inch horse artillery gun; their equipment is, therefore, considerably heavier than our own. They consider that this defect is atoned for by the greater effect of the individual round. An English division has only 54 field guns, but it has, in addition, two field howitzer batteries and one heavy gun battery, or 70 guns in all. The batteries are rather stronger than our own, because all their ammunition wagons accompany the battery; even in the column of march each gun is followed by its two wagons. In action the first six wagons are unhooked six inches on the left of their guns; besides this, the two limbers of the flank guns are unhooked on the flanks of the battery. The remaining limbers go back to the wagon line, formed by the second six wagons; these are formed up not more than 1,000 yards behind the battery. The English use their artillery by batteries or by groups; long lines of artillery have been abandoned. Thus at manoeuvres one may see single batteries scattered all over the ground at wide intervals, skilfully availing themselves of cover. One object of this wide dispersion is to bring a flanking fire to bear on shielded guns. When thus isolated, each battery forms a unit of fire. Efficient fire-control is obtained by connecting the batteries by telephone and flag to the brigade commander, and these again are linked up to the higher commanders. Great importance is attached to the co-operation of artillery with infantry, for it is considered that the main duty of the guns is to support the infantry; attacking the enemy's guns is only a means to this end. The regulations lay special stress upon the concentration of fire upon tactically important points. Since these can often be discovered only in the course of the battle, a certain number of batteries are kept in hand—that is, in reserve—for this duty. In attacking artillery the fully covered position is preferred.

The regulations lay it down as a general principle that the whole of the artillery is not to open fire at once, but only a number of guns sufficient for the tactical object to be achieved. But in defence the whole of the guns are to be placed in position at the outset, with the exception of a few batteries with the general reserve. But, even on the defensive, no more guns than are actually necessary are to open

fire. When the infantry requires support the guns must abandon their cover, regardless of the enemy's fire, and must support the infantry by direct fire. Or the artillery may even advance to the infantry firing line. Single batteries, sections, or guns may be detailed beforehand to accompany the infantry attack.

The heavy field guns are usually placed in position beyond the range of effective field artillery fire. The new 5-inch gun, with which the heavy batteries are armed, is an admirable weapon; it is a powerful quick-firer. In spite of its weight it is comparatively mobile, since the gun can be hauled back by a simple contrivance, so that its weight, when on the march, rests upon all four wheels.

* * * *

What principally strikes the foreign observer on an English manoeuvre ground is the immense front covered by the troops; this front is many times greater than we are accustomed to see in Germany. This is partly due to the desire to minimize casualties; hence one sees whole divisions extended into long thin skirmishing lines. Another reason is that the defender is afraid of being out-flanked and enveloped, while the attacker fights shy of the frontal attack, which was often repulsed, with heavy loss of life, in South Africa. Therefore the attacking force seeks to envelop its adversary by wide out-flanking movements. The regulations certainly lay it down that this enveloping attack can only be successful when the enemy is simultaneously held in front. But it would seem that the excessively thin and wide attacking front used by the English renders it difficult to exert a sufficient pressure on the enemy's front. But English officers are well aware that an unduly long front, involving a weakening of the firing line, supports and reserves, is not suited to all conditions of warfare. Several of their leading generals have pointed this out. The English are not blind to what goes on elsewhere, and they do not overlook the defects of their own army. It will be of interest to quote the remarks of Sir Ian Hamilton on his inspection of the Southern Command. These remarks were issued to his command in pamphlet form, and portions of them have been reprinted in the Press.

Sir Ian condemns the common practice of prematurely taking extended order and of always making the reserves follow in an extended line. This, he says, was done even when the ground facilitated an advance in close formation. Officers must remember that this procedure involves a danger of the troops getting out of hand. The attempt to avoid losses by taking cover must not be pushed to an extreme; in time of war it would be no pleasant task to lead a company that thought of nothing but getting under cover. Sir Ian praises the riding of the cavalry, but finds fault with their manoeuvring. The cavalry formations were often too loose; this was noticeable when the troops deployed, and in the attack. Sir Ian's

remarks on the cavalry leading are well worth noting. He considers that the leading was deficient in rapid decision, and that the leaders were frequently over-cautious, which prevented them from affording proper support to the infantry. Whether this support took the form of dismounted rifle fire or of mounted action he considers a minor point, provided that something is done to assist the infantry. This also refers to the horse artillery accompanying the cavalry; he considers that they might have been handled with more determination and boldness.

These remarks are fully in accordance with German views. We are reminded of our own Field Service Regulations: "Supine inaction and neglect of opportunity constitute a far worse fault than mistaken action."

Sir Ian gives high praise to the field artillery, which he considers second to none, except perhaps to the Japanese. "They have (he says) made great progress in the application of fire from the covered position. This nature of fire is of great importance in war, both because it reduces casualties and because of its moral effect upon the enemy, who cannot tell where the shells are coming from. The co-operation between infantry and artillery is not yet fully satisfactory. This is of the greatest importance. It is unsound to carry on an artillery duel independently of the infantry combat, or at a different time."

As regards the employment of machine guns, Sir Ian Hamilton's views differ from those now generally held in England. He wishes to see them combined into brigades and used independently, instead of being distributed in pairs among the battalions as at present. He considers that the present system is unfavourable to training in peace time, while in war machine guns will frequently be at places where they are useless. If they were employed in masses they might produce valuable effect. Finally, Sir Ian utters a word of warning against over-estimating the value of the captive balloon. This, he considers, would be of great value in reconnaissances, were it not that it betrays the presence of the troops to the enemy for many miles round.

General Sir Ian Hamilton is one of the most distinguished soldiers in the British Army; he gained his laurels in India, Egypt, and South Africa, and he is a typical example of the British general, educated by war experience under the most diverse conditions. He went through the Manchurian War with the Japanese Army. What he saw is recorded in his interesting volume, "A Staff Officer's Scrap Book." The General here reveals himself as an acute observer, with the instinct of a born commander, able at a glance to pick out the important matters from the varied panorama of events. Although his remarks are written from the English standpoint, which is not always in accordance with our own views, they are well worthy of

study in our own army. Sir Ian stands among the foremost of the men who, after the old tactical methods had failed in South Africa, took in hand the education of their troops. Field Marshal Lord Roberts was the first to grasp the lessons of those days, and during the campaign itself he created a new system of tactics, upon which the modern views are based.

Lord Kitchener of Khartoum applied his conspicuous ability and untiring energy to the same task. And we must not omit to mention Lord Methuen, now Commander-in-Chief in South Africa. But chief among these men stands Sir John French, who has held the Aldershot command for several years, and has now been appointed Inspector-General of the British Army. He succeeded to the Duke of Connaught, who did good service in this post by introducing a uniform system of training throughout the army, and whose wide experience and practical good sense have been of the greatest service to his country.

The powers of the Inspector-General would certainly seem to be somewhat limited. He cannot exert any influence upon the training of the troops, except indirectly through the Army Council. The future will show whether so keen a soldier as Sir John French can bring himself to submit to a position which debars him from personally directing the training of the army.

It must not be forgotten that Sir John French is designated as the Commander-in-Chief in war of the regular field army. Apart from his eminence as an authority on military matters, his views are therefore of great importance. As is well known, Sir John commanded the Cavalry Division in South Africa; in this capacity his name was one of those most dreaded by the enemy. He led his division with dashing boldness and untiring energy, and many looked upon him as a mere bull-headed fighter. This is very far from being the case. He was, and is, an advocate of the offensive, but he combines bold strategy with remarkable tactical caution. Thus he shows a strong preference for night operations in the attack. In the discussion following a lecture at the Aldershot Military Society he expressed himself to the following effect:—"I am persuaded that night operations will play an important part in the next great war. The battles of the future will last for days, and all movements of infantry and artillery, and all entrenching will have to be carried out by night."

In spite of his leaning towards the offensive, Sir John French is an advocate of the tactical defensive; but by this he understands an extremely active defence. Thus, on the above occasion, he remarked that the result of a battle would usually be decided by the counter-attack. We may conjecture that he considers that the small British army will mostly have to act upon the defensive, but that it will be able to achieve important successes by skilful counter-attacks. In his remarks on the recent manoeuvres, Sir John French pointed out that

the most important duty of the artillery is to support the infantry. In this he is completely in agreement with Sir Ian Hamilton. He also remarked that the artillery often allowed themselves to be diverted from their proper tactical task by the enemy's guns. As regards methods of fire, the artillery must always strive to bring a flanking fire to bear upon the enemy; this applied especially to the heavy field guns, whose range of 12,000 yards enabled them to produce important results by enfilade fire. In concluding his remarks, Sir John enjoined the divisional and other generals to leave their subordinates a freer hand in action. There were still divisional commanders who wished to lead each battalion themselves. In a modern battle, in a wide front, this sort of leading (said Sir John) was out of the question, and if attempted at manœuvres the result would be that the subordinate commanders would fail when placed in positions where initiative was required of them.

This last remark shows the wide gulf between the tactical ideas which prevailed in England at the beginning of the South African War and those of the present day. The present English tactical theories are "modern" in the best sense of the word. The British Army, trained on these lines by eminent commanders, now commands the respect even of the great armies of the Continent.

MY PROFESSION OF FAITH.

Father Petroff is one of the three best known priests of the Orthodox Russian Church in our days, the other two being the late G. Gapon and Father John of Cronstadt. Father Petroff was Professor of theology in the Polytechnic Institute until recently; he was also a most popular preacher of Orthodox theology diluted with democracy and doubt. He is at the same time a journalist and a politician and was a member of the second Duma. The ecclesiastical authorities, dissatisfied with many of his pronouncements, condemned him to penance in a monastery, which he underwent this year. Recently he was again called upon to answer certain charges respecting his beliefs. But in lieu of replying *in camera*, as is the custom, Father Petroff wrote a sharp letter to the Metropolitan Archbishop of St. Petersburg and joined to it by way of supplement the following profession of faith, which will probably cause "doubt, hesitation, pain" among the Russian clergy. As yet neither document has been published in Russia, but Father Petroff has been unfrocked. This profession of faith throws an interesting light on the degree of theological, political, and general education possessed by the most prominent, most gifted, and most highly trained members of the Orthodox Russian Church.

MORE than twenty years ago, when musing on my future, I—at that time a youthful seminarist—deliberately and firmly traced out for myself the path of the priesthood. To me the Church appeared then, as indeed it still continues to appear, as God's kingdom realised among men, the incarnation of the divinity in humanity, just as the divinity was incarnated in Jesus Christ. Ceremonies, formulas of faith, dogmatic systems do not by themselves constitute the Church. The essence of the Church is Christ, the application to life of the truth of the Gospel.

To be the herald of this truth, to take at least some part, as the servant of the Church, in building up the kingdom of God among men, I looked upon, and still do look upon, as a most sublime, and joy-giving work, a work which even in our days needs ever more and more workmen. For among us, even after nineteen centuries of Gospel preaching, there have been and are at most individual Christians, exceptional persons; but there is no Christianity, no Christian legislation. There are no Christian ethical standards of living. There is no Christian form of government. There is neither a Christian society nor a Christian state. Of the Christianity of the whole human race it would be strange even to speak. The relations of nations one to another are shaped by a spirit that runs diametrically counter to the spirit of the Gospel. The most Christian States maintain armies numbering millions for

the mass murder now of neighbours belonging to other races, now of those of their own citizens who are discontented with the methods of violence in vogue. The last resources of the deluded population are being drained for monstrous human shambles, for weapons of destruction. Massacre is raised to the level of a science—the science of slaying.

Wherein do these reciprocal relations of Christian peoples differ from the international dealings of old pagan antiquity? And wherein are the dealings adopted by States towards the citizens different from those of heathendom? Governments use violence against the nation, oppress the population. Kings take their realms for their estates, and their people for their herds. In lieu of serving the nation they want the nation to serve them. In place of the people's will they strive to set their own wishes, their caprices, often their unbridled sway. And in return for all this they take away from their subjects for the upkeep of their palaces millions and millions scraped together in pence and farthings by the impoverished masses. And such a state of things is deemed legal, has, in fact, become part of the arrangements sanctioned by custom. On the other hand the nations' demand to kings that the customs of the people should be respected is considered to be in some sort a crime, is, in fact, ruthlessly put down and punished. How much national blood has been spilled by the "most Christian and most pious" kings whenever their peoples made an effort to better their dreary lot? What pitiless cruelty and ferocity have been displayed by them when chastising a subjected country!

History is acquainted with long lists of dismal bloody reigns, but it never knew, nor does it yet know, any monarch who could say: "In my realm I established God's kingdom. My throne was the 'throne of God's justice.'" There has been, and still is, a term, "the anointed of God," but a government according to God's justice there was not and is not. There was, and there is, domination, compulsion, oppression. But the Gospel says: "Whosoever will be 'great among you let him be your minister, and whosoever will be 'chief among you let him be your servant'—the servant of the country, of the people, the minister of God's justice.

Where in Christian lands are there chiefs who would be such servants? There are none. There are neither Christian kings nor Christian governments. Neither do Christian social conditions of life obtain. The highest classes bear sway over the lowest. A little knot of them hold in subjection the rest of the population, the tens and hundreds of millions of toilers. And from the masses they have wrested wealth, power, science, the arts and even religion itself. Religion they have made their serving-maid. And to the bulk of the

* Matthew xx. 26, 27.

people they have left misery and ignorance. Instead of joy they give them drunkenness, in lieu of religion crass superstition, and over and above, toil, the toil of galley slaves, thankless and incessant.

Sacred property the highest classes term what they have seized by force or acquired by guile. When they owned slaves they gave to them, too, the name of *sacred* property. When estate owners possessed serfs the latter were likewise *sacred* property. If the have-alls could but seize the firmament, the air, the ocean and the stars they would declare all this, too, their *sacred* property. They would let them at exorbitant rents and turn them into a source of unearned income. And whenever the people, famished by want, derided, hurt in its best human feelings, raises its voice, speaks of its rights, demands for its labour a share of satiety and contentment, the have-alls let loose upon it with bayonets and cannon—the brethren of the people, only attired in soldier's cloaks and welded into a slaying machine.

Is this Christianity?

A true servant of the true Christian Church, John Chrysostom, commenting on the unequal distribution of wealth in society, laid it down that every rich man was an impious sinner or else the heir of such. The opulent were wrath at John's pronouncement. But he answered them thus:—

You are beside yourselves in consequence of my words? You call out to me, "Will you soon leave off preaching against the wealthy?" Well, I say to you: "Desist from grinding down the poor." You cry out: "You are again hurling thunderbolts at the wealthy." This is my answer to you: "It is but your own ruthlessness towards the poor that is once more made manifest. So long as you go on insatiably exploiting the needy so long will I be insatiate in scourging you wealthy people."

But these discourses of John, and the words of the few other great Church Fathers, come but as rare beams of the light of Gospel truth, bursting through the dense fog of property worshippers' satiety. The regular and, as it were, morally legalised relation between the have-alls and the lack-alls remained as it had been in heathen times. In the guise of betterment the Christian clergy introduced only alms, beneficence. They gave back to the disinherited a part of all that they had taken away, and this they dignify with the name of virtue. Christian apostles say of this crying want among millions of toilers who are confronted with the rich man's surfeit of wealth: "Such is the will of God. Where there is light there too is shadow." Sayings like these are a calumny against God, a gibe at the need of the dispossessed, a piece of brutal contempt for the suffering millions of labouring men and women. At the very best they proceed from a gross misapprehension of this fact, that for a Christian

the Gospel ought to constitute the groundwork of his entire life, not only of his personal, but also of his social and political life. For the social and the political community, like the individual person, have their justice and their injustice. The Gospel reveals all aspects, the entire breadth of justice. To set apart one species of justice for the individual, heedless of social and political justice, is not feasible; that would be to narrow down the significance of the Gospel, to whittle away the work of Christianity, to drive the Church from the street and the public place, from the tribune of rational assemblies, from the chair of the lawgiver, and shut it up under roofed premises and within the narrow walls of private dwellings. Christian morality would be restricted, stunted, if it aimed at influencing the life and conduct of the individual without also taking in and shedding light upon the structure, the arrangements, the life and the conduct, so to say, of society and the State. "That is politics," cry the clergy, "and our business is with religion." Now that is a root error. Religion is not a function of the clergy alone. Religion is the concern of all the faithful. In like manner politics is the care of all, and first and foremost of the Church. At bottom, indeed, the whole business of the Church is politics. True, it is not politics in the vulgar, distorted sense of chicanery, jugglery, adroitness, intriguing, circumventing one's adversary. That is not politics, it is but a caricature of politics.

Genuine politics is the art of arranging life to the best purpose in society and in the State. And the Gospel, with its teaching about the kingdom of God, is precisely the science of the best ordering of life, and assuredly of the life, not of the individual, but of the whole community, the entire nation, the State. Hence it is not for the clergy to object that politics is for statesmen, that the labour problem, the agrarian question, the hounding of nationalities in the State, do not concern the clergy. It is precisely the clergy whom in the first place they do concern, for fundamental social justice is violated. Whole classes of the population are injured, millions of workers are plundered. The rights of nationalities are trodden under foot by oppressors who live side by side with them and brutally humiliate their human dignity. And can it be that all this is no affair of the clergy? Whose affair is it then? Jurists throw light upon these questions from their legal point of view, political economists from their special standpoint, ministers from the angle of vision of the Government, landlords, peasants, employers of labour, operatives, approach the thorny problems each from the standpoint of his class. Who is there that in dealing with these and all kindred social and political questions rises above all these levels just enumerated to the height of the one eternal evangelical justice? Can it be that anyone who likes may rise up to this height, anyone except the clergy? Politics, forsooth, are not for them, do not concern them!

John Chrysostom's biographer, writing about the times of that great preacher, remarks: "Christianity conquered the world and was "amazed, not at the vastness of its victory, but at the pettiness of "the results attained. Everything was subjugated, yet nothing was "changed." Christianity became the State religion and the State did not cease for that to be heathen. How are we to explain this? By the fact that the spiritual forces of Christianity were not directed towards the structure and arrangements of society or the State. The Gospel was turned away from the grand work of establishing the kingdom of God in societies and States, and was concentrated on the narrow virtues of individuals and on individual salvation.

How did this come to pass? Christianity itself has been blamed for it. Defects in Christ's doctrine have been alleged as the cause. This, however, is an error. The fault lies at the door of the clergy, of the highest clergy who governed and govern the Church. The highest Christian clergy failed to withstand the blandishments of the State, once Christianity had triumphed. The clergy did not influence the State, but received from it the outer glamour, the external organisation, the external methods of influence, compulsion and punishments. In the West, in the Roman half of the world, the Church was simply transmuted into the State. The Roman patriarchs, the Popes, being the heads of the Church, were at the same time heads of the State. From shepherds they became rulers, highest ecclesiastical dignitaries. They set their personal authority above everything else in the Church. They did not seek to strengthen their moral influence, but they endeavoured by external force to preserve and intensify their political sway. The political element gnawed the Church. In lieu of God's kingdom there was a kingdom of clerics.

Nor were things better in the East, in the Greek Church. Popery is a malady which is not confined to the Roman clergy. Ecclesiastics of all denominations suffer from it. And the Greek clergy contracted it no less than the others. Here, as in the West, the higher governing monastic clergy yearned avidly for power. But as the upper order of ecclesiastics in the East did not succeed in getting the better of the imperial power, did not even dream of attempting the feat, it turned its thirst towards the interior of the Church. Overshadowing the flock and the clergy, it declared: "I am the Church." And in order to enjoy unhindered the fulness of administrative power within, the ecclesiastical dignitaries, princes of the Church, went shares with the political authorities: to the government fell inviolate power over the social and political community; to the prelates, the administration of the Church.

Under such a condition of things there was, there could be, no question of overhauling the ruling power, of morally influencing the social and political domain, of vigorously interfering with the course of events and of issuing a summons to submit to the voice of

evangelical justice. The clerics who controlled the Church were obedient to the authorities, became tools in their hands. There were, of course, individual cases where God's justice was pointed out, prophet-wise, to kings. These, however, were but welcome exceptions. The general rule was servility and obsequiousness. And that became one of the habits of the clergy and well nigh one of the dogmas of the Church. How iniquitously soever the government might behave, however heinous the misdeeds it perpetrated, the clergy in unison cried out to the people: "Hearken and obey, for such is the behest of God." At times they covered the most godless rule with the authority of God, saying that "all power is of God." Really all? How then are we to construe the word "power"? Violence, arbitrary caprice, despotism and oppression of the wildest kind, they one and all claim to be power. Are they, therefore, all of God? Slave owners wielded power over their slaves, and landowners over their serfs. Was that power from God? The keeper of a disorderly house has power over the girl who has been sold to her. Is this power also of God? Throughout the entire land people are being shot daily and hanged. And this is done by order of the authorities. The executioner erects a gallows and strangles the condemned man with a cord. Now here it is not the hangman who strangulates. The hangman is just such an instrument of punishment as are the gallows and the noose. It is the higher executioner who strangulates, the judge who pronounces the death sentence. He who executes is the administrator who ratifies the sentence. He who strangulates is that minister who erects gallows all over the country and who looks upon the gallows as his mainstay and force. The hangman of the condemned man is that supreme authority which approves the introduction of the gallows by the minister. All this hierarchy of authorities strangulates people who are fettered, defenceless, forlorn and already made harmless. Hence it is not furthering the work of equity thereby, but is wreaking a cruel, an infamous vengeance on its adversaries. How can anyone say that such power is of God? And the noose and the gallows and the hangman are of God? And the power that let them loose upon the land, is it of God? The crimes, the cruelties and the bloody punishments of the government should not be blasphemously laid to the account of God.

When the apostle declared that power is of God it was not despotism and oppression that he had in mind. Violence is not power; it is the perversion of power. To such unrighteous, violent power the apostles themselves did not submit. When the Council ordered them to do things which went against their conscience, forbade them to preach Christ, for instance, Peter and John made answer to them: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."*

* Acts iv., 19.

The servile Byzantine clergy blinked these words. For they were more deeply attached to the governing powers than to Christ's truth. How, then, could there be any question of morally regenerating society and State? There the secular power acted, and the clergy turned aside and restricted its pastoral teaching to the private individual life of man. But inasmuch as it is difficult, almost impossible, for a moral individual brought up in a Christian way to merge himself in a society foreign to him in spirit, they took to preaching the sinfulness of the world, the necessity of fleeing from turbulent, seething life to the desert, to the cloister. Asceticism sprang up; men began to seek holiness in monasticism, in isolation. Society and State were left without the light of Christianity. They lived and grew congruously with their juridical and economic principles, which are alien to the spirit of the Gospel. Against the influence of the Gospel on the social and political structures the way was barred, the creative force of evangelical justice was mutilated, deprived of its faith, dried up. Ecclesiastical thought, cut off from life, was condemned to circulate in a world of abstract dogmas and dry theological disputes: it became lifeless, scholastic.

The profession of like abstract beliefs began to become almost synonymous with membership of the Church. The monks reasoned concerning God, but into the thick of life, into the social structure, into the political scheme they did not introduce God. A special kind of atheism resulted, practical atheism, godlessness, not of the mind but of the will. In words and in thought God is acknowledged, but life and activity go on as though there were no place for Him in the universe, as though He were but an abstract term, an empty sound. A distinguished exponent of practical atheism, who grew up among us on ecclesiastical soil, was that man of unhappy memory, K. Pobedonostseff; or say, rather, that he was an exponent of that direction of ecclesiastical life which might aptly be termed Pobedonostseffdom. Pobedonostseff represented saliently and in relief the given direction in ecclesiastical life. The system itself existed before his day, and it continues after him. It is the selfsame spiritually mutilated, morally sapless Byzantinism which drove Christianity from the Church and substituted itself. This is the triumph of that terrible spirit which tempted Christ in the desert. Pobedonostseff's system, Byzantinism, are with this fearful spirit, and not with Christ. In Pobedonostseff's church there remain of Christ only words; and different meanings, other notions, have been infused into those words. The spirit that rules the Church is another than Christ's. Christ and the Gospel in the church of Pobedonostseff are not the aim, not the prime moving force; they are but means, instruments—means for attaining ends foreign to Christ and the Gospel. The Gospel is not necessary to

Pobedonostseff's Church. Indeed, the ecclesiastical system of Pobedonostseff has in its strivings diverged so far from the Gospel that the Gospel is a living and glaring reproach to it. With the Gospel the church of Pobedonostseff has only been obliged to conclude peace. The aim and the fundamental task of the synodal church, the church of Pobedonostseff, are the same as those of popery: instead of the kingdom of God, a kingdom of clerics, a kingdom of ruling monks, of princes of the church. The governing monks, dignitaries of the church, cut off by outward asceticism, by their monkish cowls, from all the joys of life, even the purest and brightest, seek consolation in domination over that very world which they have rejected. Avidly they cling to power. They sacrifice everything to this personal sway through the Church: the dignity, the liberty and independence of the Church itself, the Gospel and Jesus Christ. Our synodal church, having failed to capture the State as papism did in the west, enters its service, in order to rule at least together with the State, to grasp everything in its hands. And it holds everything in its hands, not by means of moral authority nor by the fascination of the call to the kingdom of God, but by external compulsion, by the violence of the power of the State.

Among us there is no papism, but we have what has been rightly named *Caesaro-Papism*. In our Code of Laws* the Emperor is termed head of the Church, and the word "Head" is even printed with a capital. Now, in the true Church Christ is the head, in papism the Pope is the head, as Christ's Vicar; but in the Synodal Russian Church the head is the Emperor. In the matter of cringing before the secular power, the Church could go no further than this. Here we have not merely a realm of clerics, but a realm of clerics who are in the service of the State.

The lower clergy—the so-called white clergy—are not to blame for this laxity of the synodal church, for this betrayal of Christ by the Pobedonostseff system. Or if they are to blame they are much less guilty, and only as the executors, not as the originators. The bulk of the lower orders of the clergy are ignorant, poverty-stricken, cowed down, they are comforted by none. They have been crushed by the ruling monkish order as in a press. They have been bound hand and foot. They have been deprived of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of action. Standing near to the masses of the people, to the thick of life, they discern the want and the rightlessness of their native land, they hear the ocean of sighs from below, they are choked with the nation's tears, they are suffocated by the weight of the horrible nightmare created in the land by the violence of the power that rules iniquitously. Yet they are powerless even to allude to the

* Vol. I., Chap. 7, § 42.

sufferings of their flock, nor can they cry out to the rulers that govern by violence: Reflect! Desist!

The governing monks, with their cold, lifeless, bony fingers, have throttled the whole Russian Church, stifling its creative spirit; they have manacled the very Gospel and sold the Church to serve the ruling power. Pobedonostseff's synodal department has made, the Church, this bride of Christ, the concubine of the State. There is no manner of violence, no sort of crime, no misdeed of the State governing power, which the Church governing monks have not covered with their ecclesiastical mantle, have not hallowed.

When Peter III., after having abdicated the throne, was strangled by the hands of Catherine's favourites, and when Catherine II., having stepped over her husband's corpse, ascended the throne, the Metropolitan Archbishop, Dmitry Sechenoff, greeting the new Empress, addressed her thus:

The Lord has laid a crown upon thy head. He understands how to rescue the godfearing from calamities. He beheld thy pure heart. He knew thy unsullied ways. This miraculous enthronement is a work not of human intellect and power, but of the inscrutable judgments of God and of His all-wise counsel. Preachers will proclaim this miracle. Historians will record it in their books. Future generations will narrate it to their progeny, and will glorify the greatness of God.

This discourse of the Metropolitan Dmitry Sechenoff is in some sort a catechism of the whole practical activity of the Russian synodal system which the ruling monks identify with the Christian Church. Like Dmitry Sechenoff, the governing bishops and metropolitans, the whole synodal board, have always treated, and still go on treating, all the acts of the secular authority, whatever their nature, as manifestations "of the inscrutable judgments of God and of His all-wise counsel." Judging by their acts, by their speeches, by their "pastoral" synodal epistles, one might think that the whole aim of Christianity, the whole work of the regeneration of the world by Christ, was narrowed down to the maintaining and strengthening of the autocratic régime in Russia, which is dying out. According to the monks who control the Russian Church, Orthodoxy is blended with autocracy, and for that reason whatever clashes with autocracy clashes with the Church, with God, and with Christ.

This attitude of the Princes of the Church involves a gross and criminal distortion of the essence of the Church, the reduction of the grand world-work of the regeneration of mankind to the sorry rôle of a bodyguard for the behoof of the agonising autocratic régime. The Church is not a "League of the genuine Russian people." It is not a local spiritual organisation of the Black Hundreds. The Church is a world league. It is a pan-human, supernatural and overstate organisation. In the eye of the Church

none among existing forms of government is rounded, none is fashioned off definitely and inviolable. Indeed, such a form of government as that is a thing of the future. To use the words of the Gospel, it will be the form of the coming kingdom of God, a fabric wherein everything will hold together, not by means of external force, but by an inner, general moral cement. It will be a fabric in which there will be no plundering, no caprice, no violence, no gentlemen, no workmen, and in which all will equally bear life's burdens and enjoy life's boons. To work for such an end is the business of the Church. Existing régimes, both autocratic and non-autocratic, are perfectly worthless from the standpoint of the genuine Christian Church.

There is, however, a difference in the degrees of their worthlessness: one State form is less, the other more inadequate. But of all régimes now existing in Christendom the very worst is this effete system of ours. In no other Christian land are such crying, such cynical acts of lawlessness perpetrated as in ours. Nowhere else is so much of the lifeblood of the nation spilled or with such pitiless ferocity as in our fatherland. And the monks who govern our Church keep clinging tenaciously to this authority, to this régime; they continue to compel the Church to live in unholy union with the autocracy.

The nation, the great Russian nation, the God-seeking nation, the layer of a hundred million toilers and moilers, lies like the traveller in the Gospel parable of the Good Samaritan. The nation lies robbed, beaten, bloodstained; and the clergy, the external shepherds of the Church, pass by; they are hurrying forward to the service of the ruling and the possessing classes. Who is there to announce aloud to the world the sorrows of the nation? Who will take upon his shoulders the afflictions and the woes of our native land? Who will stay and put an end to the executions done by the ruling authority?

When the Emperor Theodosius, in his unsparing anger against mutinous Antioch—where the statues of the monarch had been overturned—despatched troops to wipe out the affront in blood, the anchorite Macedonius went out to meet the soldiers, and stopping the commander on his entry to the city he said:

Go, tell the Emperor that he is not merely an Emperor, but also a man, and that as Emperor he is ruling over such men as himself, who have been created in the likeness of God. Let him end this un pitying and ferocious annihilation of God-like creatures. Let him turn over this fact in his mind, that for every broken statue we can readily produce many new ones, but that it is wholly beyond his power to call into being again even one hair of the victims who have been slain by his command.

And the sanguinary execution was countermanded.

John Chrysostom, urging the Metropolitan Flavian to visit the Emperor to plead the cause of the people, said: "One man is enough to save a whole nation if he be but animated with a holy aim." What a vast force, then, would the whole Church not exercise if the genuine Church were to utter a genuine ecclesiastical word to the authorities, to the nation, to the revolutionists and reactionaries, to the country at large. The word thus spoken would be the voice of the nation's conscience. Nay, it would be more, it would be a manifestation of the eternal Gospel truth to the conscience of the country. It would go forth and smite the hearts of all; it would be heard in all corners athwart the thunders of the revolution and athwart the crack of rifles, like the peal of a bell through the wailing of the hurricane and the souging of the snowstorm.

But the department of the Synod and of Pobedonostseff is silent. It is silent when it ought to speak out, when it ought to cry aloud, in the name of the Church, in the name of Christ. And it would be well if this petty-souled—nay, I may say soulless—department only remained silent. But it speaks too when the ruling power lists. And as for what it says. . . .

On 9/21 January, 1905, when the people—that great and naïve child—with its icons and crosses went forth to ask the authorities for justice and equity, when in answer to this demand a monstrous butchery was organised, and when gory heaps of slain men and women made the whole world shudder with horror, the Synod did not pass by this mountain of bloody corpses. No: the Synod drew near the sanguinary mound of bodies not yet cold, stood before them and in its "pastoral" epistle smote the slain with a villainous black calumny, saying that those who had gone forth to seek justice were bribed with Japanese money. In sight of the terrible hecatomb—the like of which the world had not beheld for long—from the lips of the "most holy" Synod there fell no words of reproof for the executioners, no sigh of pity for the victims, nought but calumny, deliberate calumny endorsed by the Synod, acting in the name forsooth of the entire Church.

Such a Church my conscience does not acknowledge. I believe in one holy apostolic Church; but servile monkish Byzantinism, the soulless organisation of Pobedonostseff in the guise of Orthodoxy, I reprobate with all my understanding and with all the vigour of my forces. I believe that Christ's truth will overmaster everything, and that both the Russian Church and the Russian nation will become free, and establish in their fatherland the kingdom of God. This I believe, and therefore in the near future I expect the resurrection of Russia and the life of the new, the coming world. Amen. So be it.

PETROFF.

THE FIRST OF FEBRUARY IN LISBON.

Portugal in some aspects resembles a celebrated ancient historic castle, lost in some corner of a province. Every one respects it, but no one cares about it. Suddenly a striking event bursts forth in it. The public interest in it, which seemed dead, is born again. The forgotten spot rouses passion, and is everywhere talked about. But it soon becomes evident that the castle is to us full of mystery, and we lament that we know nothing of the minds of its inhabitants; profoundly moved by the startling crime, we listen distractedly to explanations which explain nothing.

L—THE KING AND HIS PEOPLE.

NO country, perhaps, has attracted less attention of late years than Portugal. The knowledge of most civilised people about men and things in Portugal is summed up in the silly rhyme of a comic opera: *Les Portugais sont toujours gais*. Travellers, when they see that its people are far from being of a joyous turn, and are indeed rather grave and melancholy, are somewhat disconcerted. They conclude that the people have changed; and go on to discuss something else.

I have looked in vain in recent works on the psychology of nations for any penetrating account of Portugal. There is none. Economic studies of Portugal, published in other lands, are fundamentally wrong. When they are eulogistic, they care only to preach up her credit. When they are hostile, they do not scruple to cheapen even her inexhaustible resources. Yet no country lends itself to so interesting a study as Portugal. It is a veritable paradise, neglected by its inhabitants.

There is flagrant contradiction there between nature and man. The sky, the climate, the earth, show the smile of a perpetual spring. The people remain morose. The soil repays the very slightest effort of man; why, then, does he neglect it and let it lie nearly waste? The natural fertility of the land is almost fabulous. The vines are those of a country blessed of Heaven. They could satisfy the thirst of half Europe. Yet the wine you drink there, while it makes you tipsy does not please your taste. It is rough, like the ground which is uncultivated by man. The Portuguese are honest and gentle; but their successive governments have been cruel and shameless. The country has produced great explorers, perhaps the greatest ever known. It has had its poets of immortal renown, its thinkers and philosophers. It is a civilised land; and yet we

constantly see there events which belong to another age. Right in the nineteenth century a prince, Don Miguel, imitated the most fantastic performances of the Borgias. He killed his father's servants, and ended by assassinating his father himself. When he became king, he decimated his people and filled his prisons, confiscated his subjects' property and then shot them down lest they should suffer from poverty.

After that came a series of merciful and respectable monarchs. But the country still suffered under the monarchy; above all it had to endure the king's ministers. It declined while other countries grew and prospered. Even its immense and wealthy colonies failed to arrest its fall, and it is hardly fifteen years ago that this brave and loyal nation had to undergo the disgrace of a formal bankruptcy.

In recent years the decline of Portugal has been even more striking, although Don Carlos had many qualities which ought to have made him an excellent king. A distinguished *littérateur*, a skilled connoisseur, a delicate and agreeable conversationalist, he had a wide enough range of knowledge to make a good monarch. But he was among the worst. We owe the truth to the dead as well as to the living. Why then disguise the fact that the Portuguese people, divided as they are in their political ideas, were absolutely at one in their very slight esteem for their king? The king felt it, and while he felt it enjoyed a sort of strange coquetry in exasperating the people's feelings. It is necessary to dwell on this fact, for it explains much of what happened.

A French journalist a few weeks ago found himself at Lisbon, representing that great journal, *Le Temps*. The king sent for him and confided to him a manifesto, which criticised the Portuguese nation and country. It was published in France and, of course, provoked an outburst of rage. Conservatives, Progressists, Reformers, Republicans, indeed, all classes who read and thought, strongly condemned this act of the King. M. Galtier, the journalist, who had had the honour of the royal confidence, and his journal thus found themselves closely associated with the dramatic history of the past few weeks. Towards the end of January I heard maledictions by the hundred against the unhappy king who had forgotten the elementary duties of a sovereign. Every word of his manifesto was interpreted in a sense humiliating to the country. In one passage the king spoke of the want of character in Portugal. Now the word "character" in Portugal means honesty: the king called his country a dishonest one. What aberration drove this king thus to descend into the arena of politics and become the target of all the parties?

Conversing with some of the Court officials, I came to understand the strange motives which explain the king's doings. The disesteem of the people, which made an ever-widening gulf between them and

their sovereign, exasperated the monarch. Brave to a fault, Don Carlos used to walk about the streets of his capital alone without escort, everywhere meeting looks of hostility, indifference, or even disgust from the passers-by. Thus he threw in the face of his people an insult which they longed to avenge in his blood.

The king, though mild in character, fast and not serious, had the pride of a demiurge, lodged in an empty mind. The antagonism between him and his people had quite discouraged him. He sought oblivion in orgies sufficiently innocent, but which in Lisbon, a large provincial town, were thought the fêtes of a Nero. In truth he was bored. He courted all the pretty women, and was always dreaming of foreign travel.

Having thus lost touch with the people, he failed to take in the fact that his extravagance alienated all sympathy from him. So completely did he misunderstand his surroundings that he dared to accept the gift which Franco offered him in the form of an increase of the Civil list. The sum was not large, about a million francs. The country was not thereby the less poor nor the nearer to ruin, but the mode of the transaction, done without Parliament, gave it a look so awkward that all the honest part of the country turned away still more from the royal family. Isolated as he was, the king did not perceive that he could not possibly keep such a present. A thrill of horror passed through all Portugal.

The king's indomitable courage caused him still to brave popular feeling. In that friendly town of Lisbon, where even strangers seem to exchange smiles, the king alone walked through the most frequented streets without a bow from a single passenger. As the Portuguese never spoke of him without aversion, I could see for myself that the days of the monarchy were numbered.

II.—THE DICTATOR

There was one man in Portugal equal to saving the situation: it was Joao Franco. He was as much hated as the king was looked down upon. But the hate of a people is sometimes like that of a woman: it may in certain circumstances change into love. Nations, however, are only convinced by great deeds. Was Franco capable of such actions? What was there behind this man who, alone in his opinions, could stand up to a whole people in fury?

The first time I met Franco was at a dinner at the Italian Legation. He was in the habit of avoiding society, wholly absorbed in his duties: always on the *qui vive* for attacks and conspiracies, he had to defend himself against both his old enemies and the friends who were always deserting him. There were daily rumours of arrests. Bombs were found both at Lisbon and in provincial towns. Attacks on the police were reported. Men talked of conspiracies extending

all over the country. Newspapers were suspended by turns. Under a special law, it was too dangerous to speak against the king. But the hatred of the journals for Franco grew more violent. The dictator took no one's advice. His ministers, reduced to the rôle of walking gentlemen, enthusiastic but passive, obeyed blindly the orders of their chief. Franco became the real master of Portugal, a master the more to be dreaded because he held in his hands the threads of the whole political and administrative life of the country.

Whether in order to hunt out his enemies, or from fatigue, Franco often excused himself at the last moment from attendance at even the most ceremonious functions. However, on the 27th of January last he went to the Palace of Campo Santa Clara. It was one of the grandest parties given at Lisbon in the last year of the reign of Don Carlos. The splendid house of the Marquis Paulucci di Calboli, and his extensive art collections, were much admired by the Lisbon people. This amiable diplomatist, who is also a distinguished *littérateur*, is a man much liked. The diplomatic corps go to his house willingly, as do the princes of the blood, the ministers and the best society of Portugal. The company were all assembled, but we had given up hope of seeing Franco. At last, however, a great stir in the square told us that he had arrived.

There was something strange in his look, and his appearance struck me forcibly. His bright eyes were sunk in deep sockets. His striking features, his energetic gestures, gave me the impression of a fighter. Yet, when I came to look at him close at hand, his face seemed to be overcast by a kind of melancholy. His head hung a little,—a sign of fatigue; his knees seemed bent, and he had the air of a man infinitely weary.

The dictator turned to me. He said he had long followed my modest work, and was glad to welcome me to Lisbon. After a few moments, he asked: "What is there at Lisbon to interest you most; what do you want to see and study?" "A man," I said gravely, "who seems to carry in his mind the destinies of a whole country." Our conversation, interrupted by the dinner, was afterwards resumed. He told me at length of his hopes, of the policy he was going to follow, of the triumph of his ideas—which he thought was inevitable. "Our country," he said, "has suffered and suffers still from administrative corruption. There are too much extravagance and too many abuses. I shall have to reform much of the machinery and get new laws passed; and when some years hence people see what I have accomplished they will excuse my brutalities and violations of the Constitution." So saying, he smiled, with a little nervous and jerky laugh.

"But shall you have time enough to accomplish this enormous task which is before you? One must have time, if he is to act."

"You do not seem to believe in my longevity?"

"I am only expressing the doubt which reaches me here on all sides."

"You are deceived. I admit that there are some hundreds and perhaps thousands of screamers in this country. A little energy will get the better of their passing discontents. You must do violence to the ground before you can sow it. We have much to do yet." And the dictator unfolded to me the imposing plan of reforms which he proposed to carry out. He spoke as a patriot who was suffering under the woes of his country, and was determined to save it in spite of itself. He had a blind confidence in his star, the star of his country. The disagreeable aspect of Portuguese affairs, the finances, seemed to him in course of amelioration. The friendship of England relieved Portugal for some years from considering the need of restoring her armaments. The fleet might remain as it was, and the territorial army was sufficient to secure her integrity. The Portuguese of Brazil, who were rich and patriotic, would continue to take up her loans: thus the Portuguese *rente*, like that of Italy, would come back to the country itself, and be no longer at the mercy of foreigners. The assessment would have to be altered.

"It is enough," added Franco, "for me to compare what I pay on my properties in Italy and in Portugal, to see that our taxes scarcely exist. We must open our country more freely to foreign industry. It is necessary to give Portugal a salutary shake, which will put fresh life into an organism which is prematurely old."

Listening to these words I recalled the monologue of Ruy Blas, in which that hero of Victor Hugo excites himself with the thought of being the saviour of his country. There was a deep note of sincerity in Franco's words: I confess that they moved me. And yet I entertained a great horror of his methods, and a very moderate esteem for his conservative opinions.

"Do you not think," I said to him, "that your proceedings are behind our age, and that nations which have once tasted liberty will refuse to allow it to be taken from them, even on the pretext that that is good for them? There are moments when the rifles go off of themselves, and bombs are manufactured even in the schools."

"Attempts at murder prove nothing. Suppose I am assassinated. What does that prove against my ideas?"

"But in that case they could not be realised."

The conversation became general. The Marquis Paulucci, the French Minister, M. Saint-René Taillandier, the American Minister, Mr. Bryan, and several other diplomatists took part in it. Franco spoke of the elections which were to come off in April. He felt certain that they would give him a majority sufficient, with the help of Parliament, to settle the most urgent problems.

"But, my dear President," I said to him, "will you find a majority to approve your increase of the Civil list?"

Franco seemed a good deal annoyed by this observation.

"How can anyone reproach me with so just and necessary a measure? Was it not scandalous to see our king driven to run into debt and make terms with all parties in office? What an unworthy sight for a self-respecting country to see her king forced to shut his eyes to every abuse in order to get enough to live upon, himself and his family! The sum which I ask for the king is not too much. Do not forget that we have many national palaces, which the king keeps up out of his private purse. M. Fallières, certainly, has only 1,200,000 francs a year; but Versailles and Fontainebleau are maintained at the State expense."

One could perceive behind these words something more than they expressed; the anger felt by an ardent and convinced monarchist, like Franco, at seeing the royal salary haggled over which the minister thought necessary for the dignity of the kingdom.

Next day I had an opportunity of conversing with several opponents of the dictator. All admitted that, detestable though he was as a politician, his personal character was not open to attack. He prevented other men from enriching themselves at the expense of the State, but he did not enrich himself. They told me many lively stories of this plunder of the State to which Franco had put an end. It was, perhaps, the most courageous act of his reign.

As many people who respect themselves live by sponging on the State, the great ladies of the capital think nothing of following the same practice. There is a special institution, the *Palpadores*, which secures to them their share of the cake. These great ladies were charged with the task of searching female travellers as they passed through the custom-houses, and special salaries were allowed to them. It was of no use to point out that these society ladies did not exercise their powers, although they drew their salaries. With unheard-of brutality Franco suppressed these dignified functions, emoluments and all.

I met at a party one day a politician who also held diplomatic office. He was one of the few whom I heard violently attack the personal honesty of the dictator, and I was sorry to hear it. Should I have then to change my hero? I asked Count P——, formerly Foreign Minister for an explanation. "*Parbleu!*" said he, "M. X—— may well complain of Franco. He was appointed Minister of Portugal in China. He drew 60,000 francs a year for two years without ever leaving Lisbon. Franco cut off his salary. The least thing he can do is to speak evil of him."

As all men of exceptional mark live on their own ideas and for their own ideas, Franco had no friends. His friends of to-day were enemies to-morrow. For the dictator could not tolerate contradiction or opposition. But there were enthusiasts who lavished upon him touching proofs of admiration. When I saw him a second time,

a high dignitary of the Court followed our conversation attentively. Afterwards, when Franco had left me, this official said to me, with tears in his eyes: "He is a great man, almost a holy man!" I watched the two descending the staircase together. The Count, when he got to the bottom, took the little Franco in his great arms, and they clasped each other in a fraternal embrace.

III.—THE TWO QUEENS.

The king did not count any longer, and Franco was only hated. The Crown Prince Louis-Phillippe was neutral and colourless: the people relied on him less than ever. For centuries past the kings had given the country no chance. Except Emmanuel I, its monarchs had brought nothing but mortifications. But that king, the great and fortunate king, as the people called him, died nearly four centuries ago. His successors had but added to the misfortunes of the country. In the days of its greatest prosperity Portugal was always poor, for its kings were spendthrifts. Though Brazil poured gold and diamonds into the metropolis, the country remained poor and miserable. Discontent with the monarchy is centuries old. It was only dormant, and sooner or later was bound to break out.

Poor Carlos I! He inherited with the crown all the sins of his ancestors. His own expenditure was moderate and his faults slight, but the people looked at their king in the light of their ancient rancour.

While the Court was surrounded by indifference and hatred, there was one member of the royal family who enjoyed the favour of the crowd—Queen Maria Pia. Married at fourteen (it was a marriage of policy) she came to Lisbon with the glory of her father, Victor Emmanuel, and endowed with all the gifts of a "Princess Charming."

The affections of nations are instinctive and not reasoned. They attribute to their favourites the qualities which they best like. Truth and desert often have nothing to do with them; for feelings are not open to discussion. Maria Pia, indeed, played with the popular favour. Her prodigality is proverbial. In her youth she had enjoyed the unstinted extravagance of her father, and when she came to Portugal she had not had time to alter her ways. Money with her was nothing but to be thrown to the winds. She would go to a shop and buy its entire contents. She went lately to a modiste's in Paris, and seeing several hats which took her fancy she pointed to them and the modiste sent them home and added some dozens more. When they were disembarked at Lisbon the packages fell into the water. All Lisbon knew the story and pitied the poor queen who had lost her head-gear. Her treasury is depleted, nearly empty; she is troubled about it now and then, but has not resolution enough to

stop her expenditure. The people complain, but they do not want anything done about Maria Pia because she is a "true queen." "She was married so young," said a violent republican to me. "When could she learn the value of money? She has never known it and never will. But she knows how to spend it royally. Do you remember how in the *Rouet d'Omphale*, the Nemean lion, the terrible Geryon and the Erymanthian boar, conquered by the sweet looks of Omphale, crouch tenderly before her. The most excited chiefs of the opposition are like those creatures, and are quite disarmed before Queen Maria Pia."

The people also are inexplicably attached to her, and such attachments are the strongest. Everything that was told me about Maria Pia reminded me of the love of France for Charles VI., that poor king who was called the "well-beloved," in order to show that no one wanted to blame him. The country was tenderly attached to the very man who, without intending it, was the cause of its ruin and brought on its fall. In all times and places nations have had those mysterious affections for certain of their sovereigns. The reasons are not revealed to historians; which proves that nations can see further than those who profess to explain them. In the reign of Charles II., at Madrid, the infuriated mob one day surrounded the palace. The terrified queen ran to the balcony and harangued the crowd. "The king is asleep," she said. The crowd, maddened, cried out, "He has slept too long and must be wakened." The king appeared. The crowd forgot everything. A cry of affection rose from every throat. The people forgot.

One day the people rose in revolt in Lisbon and ran to the palace. Queen Maria Pia appeared at a window and spoke to the crowd: "Do you think I am afraid of you: I who have the entire army of my father, Victor Emmanuel, to protect me?" And the mob went into a paroxysm of joy, clapped their hands and cried "What a grand queen!"

Above all, she is majestic. A true daughter of kings, she is good-natured and generous: but she has never for an instant forgotten the distance between herself and the people who are born to be ruled by her or her representatives. "She is a queen, a real queen," cry the women, and the men also say it after them.

And the other queen: what is she? Still young and distinguished-looking, she brought with her to Lisbon a royal—a divine beauty. She is without doubt the most beautiful woman who has ever reigned in Portugal. Ever since she came she has tried to win all hearts. Amiable and prepossessing, she is careful to ignore, not to accentuate, distinctions of rank. She is as economical as the dowager is too prodigal. Nevertheless, the Portuguese people, who love equality and are full of democratic sentiment, prefer Queen Maria Pia to Queen Amélie.

During a brilliant performance at the opera, and while a new star, Mme. Gagliardini, was singing in *Aida*, a Court lady told me the following story. Queen Amélie in her amiable way has violated the strict etiquette of royalty. Even at the theatre, seeing there some ladies who had been presented, in her good nature she went so far as to make them a friendly sign of recognition with her hand. Well, would you believe it? it was considered that such a familiar gesture was unworthy of a queen. A silly rumour ran through Lisbon, spread by her enemies, that Queen Amélie had the *jettatura*, and in order to prove it they told of things which were all to her honour. "Do you notice," said to me an influential conservative, a descendant of an old Spanish family—which no doubt explains his superstitious credulity—"that the presents the queen makes nearly always bring misfortune with them. She gave a bracelet to one of the ladies of the Court, and some days after this lady sprained her hand. A little pony which she gave to a friend carried her friend's child over a precipice." As always happens, people forget the numerous presents of the queen which no doubt have been fortunate for the recipients, and only tell of little facts which are rare, even if true.

But the republicans have graver complaints to make against Queen Amélie. She is a clerical, which offends the Portuguese people. In that country, where the priests have to go about in civil dress and have morganic wives like royal personages, and large families like the patriarchs in the Bible, such an accusation is seriously regarded by the people. And the queen's enemies rub it in. One of the leading republicans told me that it was on account of Queen Amélie that King Carlos did not return the visit of his royal cousin at Rome. Everything had been settled for the journey when, prompted by his wife, he wrote to Victor Emmanuel that he would be very glad to visit him in Italy, but not at Rome. And after that there was a regular coolness between the two Courts. This story may be true or false; but it has passed like a storm all over Portugal, and alienated the last traces of sympathy from the widow of Don Carlos.

IV.—THE REGICIDE.

The *Journal Officiel* of Saturday, the 1st of February, published a law of "public security," the most arbitrary that Portugal had ever known. The country upon this seemed quite beside itself. In the best-informed circles grave consequences were expected; but what kind of consequences none could say.

The life of the Portuguese capital is somewhat gloomy and colourless. The great families, impoverished if not ruined, lead a somewhat secluded existence. The great embassies and the diplomatic corps afford society such animation as it has. The everlasting conflict

between the people and the Crown only increased the aloofness of high society. Without the diplomatists Lisbon would be a great city devoted to strict mourning. The legations of Italy and France, as well as the large *salons* of the United States legation, presided over with so much grace by Mr. Bryan and his sister, are the chief centres of attraction. It is there that one comes into contact with the principal currents of Portuguese opinion.

There happened to be a party in the afternoon of that very first of February at the French legation. Nearly all the diplomatists were there, as well as some of the Court ladies and the best society of the city. There was a concert for the ladies, and in another room animated conversation. The Portuguese section of the company seemed unstrung. The "ukase," as they called the law published that morning, had roused the indignation of the most peace-loving of the people. Count Passos-Viala, a most intelligent man, and formerly Minister of Public Works, spoke to me with grief of the alienation of the country from the monarchy.

"And your king?" said I.

"I have respectfully laid before him the dangers which the realm and the cause of loyalty incur through the dictatorship of Franco; but the king seems as one hypnotised."

They were trying to convince the foreign ministers of the wickedness of the dictator, and the imminence of revolution. The diplomatists listened with apparent indifference, though they took note of the remarks made to them.

"It is a curious thing," one of them said to me, "that even the men who seemed to maintain a kind of neutrality towards the dictator appear to-day to have conceived a sudden hatred of him, which forbodes. . . ." In one corner M. Castello Branco, a Progressist leader, was maintaining that a fighting organisation would in the end deal with Franco; while the Russian minister, faithful to the principles which govern his own country, eloquently proved to an excitable politician how government is always within the law, and its opponents have nothing to do but to keep within legal limits. At that moment there was a movement in the room. The French minister, pale and disturbed, entered quietly and asked all the diplomatists to follow him into his private room, for an urgent matter. And he gave them in secret the first news of the assassination which he had just received. A few minutes later, the ministers, as they came out, drew me along behind them and told me in the courtyard the terrible news: the king and his elder son had just been killed. And all, mounting their carriages, drove towards the *Necessidades* Palace, while the Italian and Russian ministers, better advised, drove direct to the arsenal, where the two bodies were lying. A lady of the Court, who had been present at the dreadful scenes, was kind enough to tell me what she had seen.

"Poor Louis," she exclaimed, amid her sobs. It was very marked how the general sympathy was for the Crown Prince, who, without fault of his own, had expiated the sins of his family. I learned many details which the newspapers afterwards published. I add some which I have not seen in print.

Queen Amélie received at the Arsenal her mother-in-law, Maria Pia, who had been sent for in all haste. Deeply moved, the daughter of Victor Emmanuel, always so brave, could hardly hold herself up. The two Queens were not fond of each other: that was a trite remark in Lisbon, and many amusing stories were current on the subject. But at this tragic moment their common grief threw them into each other's arms. Through her tears, Maria Pia cried, "My poor son." "And my husband; and my son!" sobbed Queen Amélie. "Your son?" Maria Pia had only heard half the truth.

Louis-Philippe, the elder son, was passionately loved by his mother Amélie. But the grandmother always preferred Manuel. She had no eye but for the little one, who bore the name of her illustrious father, Victor Emmanuel, and possessed his gracious manners and a special pride in the august ancestor. And while the young king was again and again obliged by his new duties to leave this chamber of sorrow, the old queen filled with her lamentations the room where the friends of the royal family were assembled. "My little one, where is he?" was her anguished question. For hours nothing was heard but these piteous cries of the old lady, seeking her little one, who had now become the only interest of her life.

In a corner, apart from every one, stood Franco. The courtiers avoided him; the Ministers dared not go near their chief: pale and haggard, he yet mastered himself and gave the last orders. At one moment an old friend went to him and pressed his hand affectionately. Franco, overcome by emotion, said to him: "They have killed my King, and with him they have killed his Minister."

I went through the streets of Lisbon. Everywhere an icy silence, a significant silence. The people made no sign at all. Here and there people told each other the news and immediately dispersed. Even the wine-shops showed no animation. The principal streets, *Augusta*, *Aurea*, wore their ordinary appearance. The shops remained open; the tramways ran as usual. When I got to the Place Rocio, I said to a little knot of officers who were standing on the pavement: "Gentlemen, is it true that your King has been killed?" One of them phlegmatically took his cigar out of his mouth, and replied without the least sign of feeling: "Yes, it is true: and the Crown Prince too." And the little group went on standing in the same spot, where no doubt they met every day.

The sight of this indifference, whether feigned or real, affected me deeply. Dining the same evening at the house of some friends, I had an opportunity of mentioning it to my hosts, and found that

they were much troubled by seeing this great city almost indifferent to the tragic event which involved the future of a whole nation. The next day, and the next after that, the city of Lisbon showed not a trace of mourning. I looked through the morning papers. A Republican journal—the *Lucta*, I think—limited itself to mentioning the assassination in a few lines under the head of “Faits divers”; while the other more serious journals had no expression of sympathy for the illustrious dead or the royal family in mourning. Only one print was outlined in black, and that was the *Diario*, Franco’s own paper. Public feeling was in unison with the journals. On the Monday not a shop was shut, not a warehouse, in sign of mourning. Three or four balconies at most were wreathed with black; they were those of the Court tradesmen.

Yet the regicide did not lie at the door of any party. It was held to be the work of a few individuals, hot heads, exasperated by the discontented murmurings of the capital and its neighbourhood. There was no mistake about the character of the murderer, for the facts proved it: his melancholy came near to madness.

V.—CONCLUSION.

The crime was accomplished. The new reign broke entirely with the régime of Carlos and Franco, and with a precipitation, a brutality, which seemed to sanction the assassination. The crime, no doubt, was odious; but they were too quick in praising its results. The regicide seemed to usher in peace and order, and brought justice instead of a savage despotism. What a dangerous argument for those who disapprove of political crimes! In the haste to make excuse for regicide I perceive a very disquieting symptom. There is something humiliating in the proceedings of the young King, forced to acknowledge the benefits derived from the assassination of his father and brother. For let us confess the fact: it was on the morrow of the crime that hundreds of people were let out of prison, hundreds of exiles returned home, and the country was relieved of the heavy Civil list. When will a monument be raised to the obscure beings who, blind or deceived, betook themselves to crime? It is only by a cold logic that one draws inconsistent conclusions. Will the monarchy emerge safe and sound from this crisis in which its very bases seem to be swallowed up? We often express our wishes for what we do not believe can come. We may wish then that this young King, so touching in his misfortune, may take heed to the sins which are not his own. His task will be difficult and ungrateful. He comes at a moment when the monarchy, like a decaying tree whose branches are drying up and the sap failing, is on the way to its fall. The finances of the State are deplorable. For centuries the bad condition of the exchequer has weighed upon the

Portuguese kingdom. The mess must needs continue. Will the monarchical parties venture to attack the abuses of favouritism, which ought to be cut up by the roots, or the tariff which both sustains and kills the country? The leaders are divided by intestine quarrels. Perhaps they would need another Franco, with energy equal to his, to break with the past. But will not the fate of the dictator be before their eyes, to daunt the very bravest? Besides, dictators do not suit our age. Nations which have once tasted liberty do not allow themselves to be deprived of it. You may go on with an established servitude; but you cannot with impunity reclaim liberties once granted, even for a short period. Perhaps there will be only one issue to this monarchy in chaos—a Republic. The other day I was visited by one of the Republican leaders, whose high character and eloquence command the admiration even of his enemies,—Magalhães Lima. "The Republic is at hand," he told me, and his face was lit up by joyful hope. "And afterwards?" said I. "Do you really believe that a change of the label alters the nature of the liquor?" "No doubt," he replied. "The monarchy has proved its character. Think of our 75 per cent of illiterates, of our undeveloped resources, of the ruins which lie all round us. It is we who will transform the government, and with changed political conditions we shall infuse a new spirit into our people." The Portuguese Republicans have an ardent faith. Let us respect this religion of theirs, which has not yet had an opportunity of either deceiving itself or of failing.

JEAN FINOT.

MODERNISM.*

SOME of you may be surprised to hear me speak with equal sympathy of people who appear to be separated by a gulf, the free-thinkers and the Catholics. You will think it a contradiction. Assuredly it is a sin against logic, but I prefer sinning against logic to sinning against sincerity. Yes! I love them both, and I love them not in virtue of or as a result of metaphysical reflection, or because of any hope of some day bringing them round to my gospel; I love them simply, and I have not even been able to understand how we could fail to love them or could speak of them very much as we might speak of the inhabitants of the polar regions and as if we did not know any of them. Now, not only do we live in the midst of them, but in each one of ourselves, did we but lend an ear, we might hear a free-thinker and a Catholic speaking. Very often our attacks on these adversaries do not mean: "We have arrived at the certainty that on such and such a special point you are mistaken"; they mean: "We are not on the same route; we will not leave ours, so yours must be wrong."

Protestants who have studied the Catholic renewal in a spirit of modesty will escape the temptation to see in it, along with Père Fontaine, a combination of *Protestant infiltrations*. In fastening that label to the new movement, the famous Jesuit was cleverly doing his business as guardian of the old conservative positions. Protestants who repeat the phrase, and carry it off with pride, persuaded that Loisy has done no more than pick up a few of the crumbs that fell from the table of Harnack, border on the ridiculous if they do not fall into it altogether.

Without being obliged to study the history of the new Catholic thought, a very simple research suffices to show that it does not take

*The following pages do not consist of a résumé, in the exact sense of the word, of the Jowett Lectures by Paul Sabatier. They are the passages in which dominating ideas took form.

its origin from the region of Reform. The new spirit which is about to transform the Church hardly appears anywhere in Protestantism; its numerical gains from amongst the clergy are diminishing more and more, and its assimilation has become almost nil.

All the titles which have hitherto been given to this movement present difficulties and constitute a source of error. *Modernism* is the name most used; it is under that name that the new trend of thought has been condemned by Pius X., but it seems to imply an attempt at a compact with the ideas of the day, a sort of opportunism or bargain which is not in the least in the minds of the modernists; *Neo-Catholicism* seems to indicate a tendency which would not quite be the natural outcome of the evolution of the Church; *Reformism* makes one think of an attitude of examination and criticism which is very far from being a characteristic of the new thought; the title *Intellectual Catholics* is still worse, for it would seem to imply that they are disposed to group themselves apart from their brothers, which is the opposite extreme of the truth; the name *Liberal Catholics*, suitable as it may be, has been too much used in the past to denote efforts which have differed widely from one another and have only been alike in that they have all failed miserably. The champions of the present movement do not in any point resemble those amiable believers who desired to reconcile science with faith, and who, not knowing how to achieve it, have cut off the wings of both.

I shall, therefore, use these names as little as possible, especially as even when taken altogether they could not give any adequate idea of the wideness and the depth of the new movement.

It is very difficult to give even approximate figures. In certain dioceses of France and Italy almost all the younger priesthood has been won over to the new ideas, whilst in neighbouring dioceses the proportion may be no more than a sixth and sometimes even less. The "penetration" has been effected through the Catholic institutes and through the seminaries. In a certain diocese, administered successively by some of the most conservative priests, the transformation is nevertheless already complete. The cause of this was simply that the seminary had during the same period two professors of exceptional merit, one who, as a truly scientific man, thought that all truth, even exegetical, was orthodox; the other, a prophetic soul, who inoculated his pupils with the instinct of sincerity and the desire for virile and real activity which gave marvellous fecundity to their life. Life is more contagious than death. Although the majority of aged priests have remained riveted to their materialistic cult, we have also seen venerable canons blossoming at the end of the season, and if they could not always keep step with their young colleagues, they have followed them with their wishes, their prayers, and unequivocal proofs of their sympathy. Presently I will read you some words addressed by a bishop to Pius X., and you will catch

the note of warm friendship for men whose intellectual position is not quite understood.

Perhaps you have already guessed the characteristic trait of the present Catholic movement, the trait which distinguishes it from previous liberal efforts. The latter were always a more or less complete revolt against certain dogmas, certain practices, certain superstitions. Men walked round the tree of the Church and with a stroke of the shears cut off a few parasitic plants which threatened to stifle such and such a portion of the tree. Then they returned to their homes to enjoy the applause provoked by these innocent operations amongst unbelievers, and to join the ranks of the martyrs because of the fierce protests which arose from amongst the devotees. One sees no attitude of this kind in our modernists. They neither remove saints from their niches nor destroy superstitions. They have other and better work to do. Their activity has nothing negative about it; they do not aspire to be anti this person or anti that thing, which is so easy, so apt to create illusions, so blustering and so empty.

No doubt Jourdes, Saint-Expédit or Sainte-Philimène occupies but a small place in their religious life; they hardly concern themselves with acquiring indulgences, delivering souls from purgatory, or collecting relics. But they have not the optical illusions about these things of certain devotees, nor of certain rationalists. The real way to get rid of parasitic plants is not to fight with them directly, it is to intensify the culture of good plants. Without studying to do so, but simply because they are young and valiant, the modernists aim much less at uprooting errors than at affirming the truth and increasing life.

In fact we must not look for their origin in a critical or even scientific effort; they are Catholics, and the only difference which distinguishes them from their co-religionists is that, being, one might almost say physically, stronger, their faith is more virile, more triumphant; it is faith, sight, the apprehension from now and the creation of the realities of the future; and their faith is so firm that they do not even dream of reserving an intangible domain. The man who reserves certain subjects and does not allow them to be entered upon is not sustained by faith, but gnawed by incredulity.

This magnificent movement for renewal has been brought about gradually by the new desires which for a long time have assailed the clergy, especially the desire to work, to love the people more efficaciously, to speak to, to be heard by, and to come into contact with the democracy. Then evolutionary ideas came, which enlarged the horizon and showed us in an entirely new light the old Christian idea of man called to collaborate with God in the work of creation.

From its birth it was exposed to formidable opposition, which to-day has even developed into explicit condemnation on the part

of the ecclesiastical authority. To confine myself to the three essential documents, by his encyclical to the Italian bishops, *Pieni l'animo*, of the 28th July, 1906; more recently by the approval he gave to the decree *Lamentabili*, drawn up by the Holy Office on the 3rd of July, 1907, and which will no doubt keep the title of Syllabus which the journalists of Rome gave it even before its existence; and finally by the famous encyclical *Pascendi* of the 8th of September, 1907, Pius X. has indicated his firm intention to wage desperate war on modernism.

He has a right to do so; it is even his duty, since, with his mentality, that of being a passive receptacle for revelation, all effort, all labour, and all questioning constitutes for him a kind of hateful profanation.

It is therefore quite evident that the Pope repudiates, and even curses with all his strength, the tendencies of the younger men. The latter for a long time, owing to a sentiment of filial piety that one must be greatly wanting in refinement not to understand, deceived themselves with illusions; they did not want to understand what was nevertheless pretty clear. The Pope is against them. Hitherto, though, it has not been the Pope speaking *ex cathedra* in virtue of his infallible mastership. Did he think of taking this action and then draw back suddenly in fear of the responsibility he was about to assume in the face of all history, on account of the disturbing sensation that with one stroke of the pen he, the Pope, was going to create a schism, whereas right across the centuries the dominant idea of the Apostolic See—its almost sickly anxiety, so much had all other considerations been sacrificed to it—had been to maintain unity? Did he have an instinctive shudder at the thought of thrusting outside orthodoxy perhaps half the younger clergy, and that half which, morally and physically—Pius X. does not care much for intellectual value—is most important? Did he feel the earth tremble under his footsteps? Did he suddenly have a clear vision of the awful isolation in which he found himself? Did he perceive that the gates of bronze are now scarcely ever entered except by tourists for whom the Pope is one of the curiosities of the Eternal City, or by the prelates of the Palatine, by valets and mercenaries? Where are the popular crowds of the beginning of his pontificate? Where are the intellectuals? Where are the men engaged in life—with ideals—who used to come to do an act of deference? *Ramenghi!* one might say, to use a word of Venetian dialect which I once heard fall from the lips of Pius X.: *Ramenghi!* Where are the dreams of former years? They have drifted away! Did anything of this kind enter into the thoughts of the Pope? We know nothing of it, and perhaps shall never know.

I am inclined to believe, however, that these anxieties did not beset him. He takes note of the fact that neither in the Sacred College nor in the episcopate are his decisions accepted with

enthusiasm, but he consoles himself with the thought that truth has always met with these difficulties, and with childlike candour he reckons on the miracles by which heaven is going to manifest its will.

What is certain is that Pius X. condemns modernism, yet without having so far pronounced judgment against it *ex cathedra*, properly speaking.

It is a strange thing! Many Protestants who profess not to believe in the pontifical infallibility, as soon as modernism comes up for judgment, speak as if they did believe in it. They tell us: "Catholicism is a religion of authority, it is popery; now the Pope rejects the modernists, so the modernists are not Catholics." This argument is specious. I recognise it readily as the argument which fills the columns of *la Croix*, of *l'Autorité*, of *la Libre Parole*, and that it is held in much honour at the Vatican, as well as amongst the Assumptionists, the Capucines and the Jesuits. The Protestants of whom I spoke just now are in perfect agreement in their judgment of the modernists with the monks I have just enumerated. It is strange that they are also in agreement with a certain number of the fanatics of irreligion, and of those pitiable militants who profane the name of free thought and pretend to cure us of clericalism by raising up in opposition to it their nauseating merchandise.

Believe me, that what I say is no airy supposition. No later than last year, *la Civiltà Cattolica*, the celebrated organ of the Jesuits in Rome, attacked me furiously in a series of articles. Of course I did not reply, for we cannot expect our adversaries to interpret our thought exactly. However, in one of these articles a page of mine had been quoted, and for the word "clericalism" had been substituted, I think unintentionally, the word "Catholicism." In other words, all that I had said against *clericalism* I was made to say against *Catholicism*. I felt that a denial was necessary, and I wrote a most respectful letter to the Rev. Father Brandi, pointing out the actual error which had slipped into the quotation. He replied very politely that my letter would be sent on to the author of the article as soon as he had returned after the holidays, and that the author would then rectify the mistake. This was at the beginning of summer. In October I sent a letter of reminder. Then Father Brandi replied that he considered any correction useless, since for them, the Jesuits of the *Civiltà*, the two terms, Catholicism and clericalism, were synonymous.

You may well suppose that I hastened to point out to him that the question was not to know what they, the Jesuits, thought, but what I had written, and that by substituting this word they attributed to me exactly the contrary of my thought. I received no reply.

Not wishing to bring the good Fathers into court, I published the whole of our correspondence in the *Giornale d'Italia*, which made use of the occasion to start an enquiry: Are the terms clericalism

and Catholicism synonymous? Then was a strange spectacle to be seen: that of the most ardent adherents of clericalism agreeing for the moment with pastors, freemasons, and the fine flower of anti-clericalism in declaring that clericalism and Catholicism are two perfectly synonymous terms. Some of the pastors in Rome in particular abused me without pity. They did not bring me round to their point of view any more than did the Jesuits. Certainly I could not see one straw, one fissure in the logic of their arguments, and I am simply led to say that logic is something, but it is not everything. Beware of the arguments of the advocate. It is not a question of convicting our adversaries of error, but that we should be in the truth. So let us know how to see things as they are.

In fact, the Church is a religious society which has issued from Christ and from Judaism, whose origin and development we can study as we can those of any other human association. It is a sort of fatherland, or rather a yet more complex society than a nation, and one which, far from being evolved, is still, in spite of its long centuries of existence, only at its initial period. It is a society which strongly resembles other religious or even political societies, but it has taken a title which has suddenly conferred on it a special character; it has called itself Catholic, a word which in itself alone contains the most splendid of programmes, and the consequences of which we can scarcely foresee. Oh! I know well that it has often been used to cover many crimes, many ignominies—like all the banners, like that of free-thought, like that of the Gospel, it has been carried by criminal or infirm hands. That is no reason not to see the good which has been done under its shadow, nor, above all, the heights towards which it is striving to guide our footsteps.

The Church is a human society, which inevitably has a government. This government may be good, it is often bad, it will always be imperfect, and, like all the governments, it is exposed to various perils, especially to that of taking itself too seriously. It begins by serving, but it becomes gradually accustomed to rule. The Pope speaks of himself as *servus servorum Dei*, servant of the servants of God, just as the members of a cabinet call themselves ministers, which does not keep one and another of them from conducting themselves as real masters, sometimes as tyrants. The government of the country has thus a tendency to impose itself little by little on the country. It looks upon its personal friends, its partisans, as the best citizens, sometimes as the only good citizens. Happily public good sense is there, and also political vicissitudes, to correct what may be unjust and odious in such judgments. At the time of the Dreyfus case the partisans of revision were incessantly described as bad Frenchmen, as if they were traitors, and had been bribed.

What should we have said then if anyone had come and said to

us: "You proclaim yourselves Frenchmen; now the Government rejects you and persecutes you; therefore, since you recognise the Government you are bad Frenchmen?"

It is exactly this reasoning which so many Protestants use in reference to the modernists.

Protestantism had a double interest in separating modernism from Catholicism. It might hope to receive the deserters, and in any case it would show that all that is alive and young in the Church is in some sort adventitious to it. I will not believe that calculations of this kind have influenced our judgment; but the devil is subtle, and we shall do well in the future to be carefully on our guard.

* * *

If I have succeeded in explaining myself, you now see in what direction the Catholic renewal is going; it is moving towards a profound transformation—a transformation which, far from being the negation of the past of the Church, will be the splendid opening out of what I might call her better self. First of all it is moving towards a renewal of the idea of authority. The Reform in the sixteenth century had deposed the seat of authority; it said that authority was not in the Church, but in the Bible. But everything that the Roman theologians said about the authority of the Church, the reformers said about the authority of the Bible. It was a transcendental revelation before which man must hold his peace and worship. Man was made for it, and not it for man.

Catholic modernism, on the contrary, does not dream of deposing the seat of authority, but of transforming the very idea that authority has made of its own rôle, and consequently the species of submission due to it. It does not go out in search of a government which has fallen from heaven, but it accepts the government of the day, without enthusiasm and without reflection. It does not revolt, it simply leads authority on to discover for itself its own infirmity and powerlessness in the civilisation of to-day.

Allow me to read to you à propos of this the words addressed by a French bishop to Pius X. in the month of May last:

"It is sad to discover that the phantoms of Gallicanism and of Jansenism still stray about the lodges of the Vatican, and that one has to think of them when one desires to explain certain measures which do not exhibit an excess of confidence with regard to the French episcopate. At no point in history has unity been stronger; the danger of schism exists only in the imagination of a few journalists at a loss for copy, which does not mean that we have a coarse and pharisaic idea of it such as prevails in certain circles. For us it belongs more to the future than to the past, it is more in the intention than in the formulæ, more in the continuation of life than in a rigid and often deceptive sameness.

"It is a fact, perhaps the essential fact, of our religious life, and precisely because it is a fact of unheard-of power, we do not think about it, and we are surprised, distressed, at times even irritated, when anyone requests us to give proofs of fidelity. The united families are those in which protestations of love are superfluous.

"The father has the right to rule and to be obeyed; but yet he must not command for the pleasure of commanding and in order to test the fidelity of his children. Authority is not an end, but a means."

No doubt you think this very timid and humble language, and you are not wrong; but I should wish, nevertheless, that we may succeed in understanding that there are timidities of love more beautiful and more fruitful than all the assurances. A son may be ever so right in embracing different ideas from those of his father, but I do not like to see him revolt and go away from home to seek encouragement from his father's rivals.

Time would fail me to show you the transformations which are going to be achieved in the attitude towards dogma and towards worship. In that respect also a glance is sufficient to see that there is no analogy, no connection whatever, between Protestantism and modernism. The modernists are Catholics who accept the whole heritage of their Church, and, far from revolting, aspire only to use their strength in the service of their Church; far from complaining of their punishment, they wish their bondage to be succeeded by active and joyous obedience.

Believe me that amongst the modernists there are many who know as well as we do all the sad things which we think of when we pronounce the word Rome. They suffer from them more than we do, and it is just because they suffer from these things, whilst we only detest them, that they are corrected, or rather purified by them.

PAUL SABATIER.

ARBITRATION COURTS AND WAGES BOARDS IN AUSTRALASIA.

THE British politician who visits Australia finds himself in a new world. Outwardly, the land is British—much more British than Canada is on the surface. But so soon as he goes beneath the surface, he comes upon currents of thought and intention which run counter to those in which he is accustomed to move. Institutions and ceremonies are copied from home, but the spirit developing behind them is native Australian. Elections for areas as large as Europe fought for less than a £20 note, payment of members, women's franchise, have created a political state unlike any which exists elsewhere, and when terms are used in Australia similar to those employed here, they generally mean in reality something very different. For instance, "Liberalism" in Australia—if not in New Zealand—is essentially different in its content from Liberalism here; and though one has to describe the Australasian economic policy as "Protection," the word signifies little of what it indicates to us. To one who goes out as a Labour Member of Parliament with a special interest in the attempts that the legislature can make to aid equitable distribution of wealth, Australasia is particularly new. There, one finds his cherished economic and political axioms regarding the futility of trying to fix wages by Act of Parliament laughed to scorn, his theory that Trade Unions are purely voluntary organisations of the legal character of a club emphatically contradicted, his notion that the right to strike is an inalienable attribute of individual liberty flatly repudiated. Our kindred in the new lands over the seas are setting up laboratories where experiments in social legislation can be carried on. If they fail, not much harm can be done. "Oh! the Government 'will get us out of our difficulties,'" remarked a manufacturer to me, when I suggested that the failure of some of these experiments would be shown only after industries were ruined. "They will 'increase the tariff, or give us bounties, or do something else.'" If they succeed, they may induce us to revise many of our ancient assumptions, and to legislate in directions which we have hitherto imagined to be profitless.

But if we try to profit by the Australasian example, we had better

be careful to understand what it is and under what conditions it works. Searching criticism should precede copying.

These experiments in Australasia originated from two different sets of ideas and conditions. In 1890 occurred the maritime strike which paralysed Australasian trade for the time being, and made the people determined to find some way of settling disputes in a more rational manner. Bill after Bill was introduced into Australian Parliaments, but the most practical, and the one that began the most consistent series of experiments, was piloted through the Parliament of New Zealand by Mr. Seddon's gifted lieutenant, the Hon. W. P. Reeves, now High Commissioner for the Dominion in London. The Act has been amended several times, but the idea it embodies remains the same, however much its administration has departed from the intention of its author. Conciliation was to take the place of strikes. A Conciliation Board was, therefore, established for each of the seven industrial districts into which the country has been divided, and consists of an equal number of representatives of employees and employers, with an impartial chairman. The decisions of this Board may be appealed against to an Arbitration Court consisting of one representative of the men and one of the employers, with a judge as president. The purpose of the legislation was clearly to establish conciliation—to get employer and employee to agree—to make everything voluntary after the Board had been compelled to sit. Even the decisions of the Board were to be binding only on those employers and workmen who were represented. Mr. Reeves estimated that from seventy to seventy-five per cent. of the disputes dealt with would be settled by the Board without resort to the Court at all. In practice, all that has been swept away. Practically every important decision of the Board has been appealed against, and the practice has grown up of taking cases direct to the Court. Arbitration has grown; conciliation has become atrophied. The force of a legal decision, not the reasonableness of an arrangement, has emerged from the New Zealand legislation.

The fact that it was the fear of trade disputes that moved Mr. Reeves is quite apparent in the machinery which he created to enable his Court and Boards to run. He had to legislate for Trade Unions and Masters' Federations. He therefore made them the basis of his proposal, and his Bill bore the explanatory title:—"To encourage the formation of industrial unions." No case could be brought before a Board except by a Trade Union of seven or more members, or by a Federation of Employers. Thus combinations of labour and capital were not only given statutory recognition, but the law practically compelled their formation. Combinations of employers and employed became legal entities with powers to sue and liabilities to be sued, and the rules and working of the Unions came much more closely under the purview of the Labour Department than those of registered unions here come under the control of the Chief Registrar

of Friendly Societies. The effect of this law upon industrial combinations is seen in the following figures. In 1896, when the Act came into operation, there were only one union of employers with 30 members and 65 unions of workpeople with 9,370 members. In 1906 there were 109 unions of employers with 3,337 members and 274 unions of workpeople with 34,978 members. During the same period the number of factories in the country had increased from 4,647 to 10,788,* whilst the number of workpeople engaged in them had grown from 32,387 to 75,310.

It is seen at once from these figures that the essential condition of success of Mr. Reeves' experiment—the organisation of capital and labour—has been secured, but that it has, in this respect, been more beneficial to capital than to labour.

It may be argued, however, that this is the condition of peace, and that, as all disputes are settled by a Court hearing evidence, these considerations do not count. To emphasise this point of view, attention might be drawn not only to these figures but to the fact that a Trade Union in New Zealand is a different organisation from what it is here. "I admit," said a leading Trade Unionist, now a member of one of the New Zealand Houses of Parliament, "that the arbitration law has taken the steel out of our Unions. Except in so far as individual employers break the awards of the Courts, the Trade Union officials come into little contact with them, and even when awards are broken it is the Arbitration Court which deals with the offence, the factory inspectors lodging the charges. When alterations in awards are asked for, the Union officials again have to create a technical dispute with the Employers' Federation of the trade and the Court decides the case."† "Our Union officials," said a workmen's representative on one of the Conciliation Boards, "exist for the purpose of creating technical disputes in order to put the Arbitration Law into operation." "We have industrial Unions, not Trade Unions," said another active Trade Unionist, trying to emphasise this difference. Everything is mechanical; everything has the appearance of a calm judicial process, the workmen making demands, the employers resisting them, the Court hearing evidence and giving its decision.

Such is the position in its general features. How does it appear after detailed examination? The Arbitration and Conciliation machinery of New Zealand, as I have said, was originally designed to be conciliation in the main, based upon agreement; it has become arbitration in the main, based upon a judge's decision. The distinction is important. It strikes right away the validity of any comparison between voluntary Conciliation Boards and Compulsory Arbitration

* It should be noted that the definition of factory had been changed in the meantime (1901), so that the increase is partly only one of statistics.

† Mr. Justice Chapman always discouraged the Unions from prosecuting when employers had broken decisions of the Court. He encouraged the Labour Department alone in this work.

Courts. The Voluntary Conciliation Board is essentially part of competitive industry. It exists only as long as it has the confidence of both sides. Its continued existence depends upon its equity. It, therefore, cannot begin to play with wages and conditions, altering them artificially. It prevents deterioration, it secures to the workman some share in the improvement in production, it does not allow capitalists to assume that labour has no rights and that its reward is the last thing to be considered in the apportionment of the national income. The improvements it gives are, therefore, real, in the economic sense, and not nominal, because they are (speaking of a free importing country, at any rate) what the mechanism of industry carried on in its most economical form will bear. All this follows upon the circumstance that the decisions of Voluntary Conciliation Boards are genuine agreements arrived at with reference to the condition of trade, its cost, the advantage of its exchanges, and so on.

The Arbitration Court is different, however. Neither side may accept it, but both must obey it whether they like it or not. "The effect of the system," said Mr. Justice Chapman, in delivering a judgment in December last year, "is that conditions sought by one party may be forced upon the other party against their will, and this may be carried to the extent of forcing upon particular employers and their employees conditions which neither have sought and which are distasteful to both."* The Court gives both sides a sporting chance of benefit. Mr. Victor S. Clark, one of the most impartial critics of the New Zealand and Australian experiments, writes of this aspect: "So great is this evil that the Court in New South Wales has recently adopted the policy of giving artificially-created disputes no standing in fact." On the whole, the Voluntary Conciliation Board settles disputes which have arisen owing to the movements in markets; the Arbitration Court settles disputes created in order that reference may be made to it. The Arbitration Court is an institution which creates work for itself, and its decisions tend more and more to show the agitating and political power of one side. It therefore works in grooves; it is more "legal" than a Board of Conciliation; and it brings the judicial function—it is presided over by a judge—into an unhappy contact with the political function. It passes its own "laws" and then it interprets them. This happens not only owing to the special character of the plaintiffs and defendants, but to the kind of work given it to do. A judge is not the person to settle wages and industrial conditions. Some judges may be good industrial arbitrators, but they are not that as judges, and we can see in the later Australian fiscal legislation, where it is provided that a judge shall decide whether the prices of imported articles are fair, the spread of a most objectionable confusion between judicial, industrial and legislative functions. The

* This has actually taken place in the case of the Auckland tailoring trade, when the masters and workpeople both resisted conditions forced upon them by other districts. Their opposition was over-ruled (June, 1905).

Arbitration judge is really a law maker, settling hours, pay and general conditions of labour, and the "facts" placed before him must of necessity be weighed in the loaded scales of social and economic theory.* Hence, we find that the harassed Presidents of the Australasian Industrial Courts have had to resign one after another, because their offices were untenable—the latest resignation being that of Mr. Justice Hood, who, as Judge of the Industrial Appeal Court, reversed a decision of a Victoria Wages Board. The men thereupon struck and the employers yielded.

Thus, quite apart from the theories and intentions of their founders, the Arbitration Courts have been used by the Trade Unions almost exclusively with the intention not of fixing a minimum rate, but of claiming periodically a larger and larger share in national wealth. The Courts are not Courts of industrial disputes, but Courts for the distribution of wealth. "The Courts have become an agency for 'industrial reform,'" says Mr. Clark. Can they fulfil such a function? is the real problem which their records in New Zealand raise.

But still examining their avowed purposes, let us consider whether they are effective as guarantees of industrial peace. This cannot be determined by the experience of a few, nor even of a considerable number of years, provided that the labour market keeps in one condition all the time. For instance, ever since 1896 the New Zealand labour market has been good. The great natural wealth of the country has been developed, owing largely to the enlightened Socialistic policy of the Government; land legislation has been carefully planned to extend the area of cultivation and establish outlets for the population; manufacturing industry has been nurtured without making it parasitic in its effects, and local consumption has steadily increased; immigration has never been allowed to flow in in a flood; extensive Government works have been in progress. Surveying the industrial condition of New Zealand since the disastrous collapse and panic from which it began to recover about 1895-1896, one has to say that it has shown a slow, steady, and well-assimilated improvement. Our New Zealand cousins are not attracted by the flashy spurts of progress which look well at the time, but which mean instability and anarchy. In the end, I am convinced, they will be proved to be wise. They go on steadily and absorb their gains as they proceed.

But this policy of "ca'canny," whatever else may be said for it or against it, has undoubtedly steadied the running of the industrial machine. It has been carried on behind a Protection wall high enough

* It is interesting to note that in recent Trade Union criticisms of the Court, the Labour leaders show that they are stumbling upon this objection, led to it by experience, not by thinking out the real nature of the machine. That Mr. Justice Chapman was *making* law, not administering it, was a grievance voiced at the Annual Conference of Trade Councils in New Zealand in 1906. But when Mr. Justice Williams, on considerations of equity, put into his awards a provision that preference should be given to Trade Unionists, he was legislating and not administering, and when the employers attacked him, as the workers attacked Mr. Justice Chapman later on, one of the leaders of the Unionists wrote:—"It is something extraordinary that enemies to the workers should be permitted to traduce the Labour Courts with impunity."

to give a fair amount of latitude for a manipulation of nominal wages, and to enable the exchange of all commodities—including that of labour power—to be carried on at high nominal standards. Wages have been high, prices have been high, rents high, and profits have been by no means meagre. Under such circumstances it was easy to prevent disputes, and until the margin of such circumstances has been reached no real test can be placed upon the New Zealand and West Australian methods of arbitration as guarantees of industrial peace. The margin can be widened, as the Commonwealth Government is now widening it, by heightening the Protective wall and thus allowing exchange to be carried on at higher nominal standards—higher wages, rents and prices. All that this really amounts to is preventing industrial competitors employing a system of low standards of exchange from upsetting a system of high standards of exchange.

But, however far off the margin may be pushed by political policy, an intelligent Labour Party must see that the pushing policy solves no economic problems. It is only postponing the final problem of distribution by assuming that it is a problem in politics rather than in economics. It is, therefore, not a permanent guarantee of industrial peace, though it will always put obstacles in the way of war.

Recent occurrences in New Zealand show that this is so. The New Zealand system of exchange has now come to the margin beyond which the manipulation of nominal price cannot be carried to any great extent. "The Arbitration Law is breaking down," was a common remark made to me by active Trade Unionists. "Why?" I asked. "Because the Court is going against us," was the reply. When I was there, the decision against the maritime workers had just been given. The men had asked for an increase of 25 per cent. in their wages, and the Court had decided against them. I was assured that if they had struck they would have got the increase without much trouble. Mr. Justice Chapman was being attacked, and some of the Unions were making up their minds to adopt British methods. When I said that New Zealand had not banished strikes I was blamed for prophesying without knowing. Before I left Australia there was a strike of Auckland tram-men, and a week or two afterwards the more serious dispute amongst the slaughtermen broke out.

I have endeavoured to prove that Arbitration Courts are effective only in so far as it is possible for a country to keep increasing the nominal rates of exchange upon their markets—both labour and produce—and only so long as the workers' attention is absorbed in increasing the standard of exchange on the labour market and they neglect to study its effect on the other markets—or so long as the economic system of a country is expanding without a great surplusage of labour.*

The whole system, however, is artificial and insecure. When one

* Thus, in a new country, Arbitration Courts might put a brake on over-capitalisation, though not upon a high percentage of profit.

examines the fabric closely, one sees that the least breath of wind could blow it to atoms. If the Trade Unionists in New Zealand lost confidence in it, it would not exist for a day. It grips the capitalist. He cannot resist. To him it is like our own Factory Law. It has fines and penalties attached to it, and if he breaks it he must suffer. And it is easy to make him suffer. Nominally, the Trade Unionist is under the same disabilities; but the slaughtermen's strike shows how impossible it is to enforce penalties on a crowd of workmen. We have not yet heard the full story of that strike. It stands to reason that if thousands of men cease to work illegally, it is impossible to fine them as the law provides, and imprison them if they do not pay the fine. This is a case of nominal equity which cannot be carried out in real life. Dealing with this strike, the Report of the New Zealand Department of Labour for 1907 says:—"The men were fined individually £5 each for having aided and abetted a strike. Some have paid the fine in full; some are paying by instalments to the Labour Department. . . . It has brought to the front the great importance of the question whether the Arbitration Court could punish men by imprisonment if the fines inflicted upon them by the Court are left unpaid and even laughed at."

What is the meaning of this cryptic statement? Did the Department step in and pay the fines? Did the Government stay execution of the law upon the obstinate strikers? It was wise if it did. But could such a thing be done in a larger and industrially more complex community? Could our own Board of Trade do such a thing? And yet, apparently, the New Zealand Government has had to recognise that the law cannot be applied to masses of workpeople, acting illegally, in the same way that it can be applied to employers acting illegally. The State has really no power to enforce its Arbitration Law.

The effect of the Arbitration Law upon the general distribution of wealth is also meagre. It has raised the standards of exchange. On the most generous estimate it has been calculated to have raised wages by about $8\frac{1}{2}$ to 10 per cent., but the cost of living has at the same time increased between 15 and 30 per cent., and though all this increase is not due to Court decisions, a large part of it undoubtedly is, because there are instances of the representatives of the employers meeting to receive a Court decision and adjourning to agree to value it in terms of price. This happened in connection with the Wellington slaughtermen's award; and coal prices, I was informed, in the South Island followed the same course. "Therefore," concludes Mr. Clark, after reviewing the evidence, "industrial regulation increases the 'cost of living,' and to this extent the redistribution of wealth apparently caused by the Arbitration Courts is illusory and the intentions of labour are defeated."

That the Trade Unionists have so long accepted this condition of affairs must not be taken as evidence that it has been satisfactory

to them. They have been constantly demanding amendments to it of such a nature as to establish a widely reaching supplementary system of control. The Arbitration Act led the Trade Unionists of New Zealand on to a wrong road, and unwilling to turn back, they have been trying to make the best of their wanderings. A study of the reports of the Annual Conferences of Trades Councils in New Zealand is very enlightening in this respect. A great part of the business done at the Conferences, judging by the bulk it occupies in the published reports, has been discussions on the shortcomings of the Arbitration Law. I have by me the last three reports—one ought to have been published since, but it has not reached me yet—and it is interesting to study the evolution of labour opinion on the Arbitration Law as shown in these papers. So long as the judge was giving decisions in favour of the Unions all went well, except that the employers kept attacking the Court. But when the Court began to slacken in giving benefits to the workers, the Trade Unions opened their attack upon the president.

But even when Labour was most pleased it wanted amendments, the chief of which was a clause making it compulsory upon employers to offer work to Trade Unionists in preference to non-Unionists, or, as a minority have demanded, a clause making the membership of a Trade Union compulsory upon all workers in trades subject to awards. These demands are perfectly reasonable in equity. If the onus of putting the law in operation devolves upon Trade Unions, and if the law specially purposes to create Unions for the public benefit, the men who form Unions and keep them going should receive some advantage over those who simply step in and reap the benefit of the existence of Unions. This has been partly admitted by the Arbitration Court itself, and if anyone objects to it, it should be recognised that the evil lies in the method of compulsory arbitration. A preference for Trade Unionists where workmen are required, or compulsory Trade Unionism for the trades affected by awards, is an essential part of the New Zealand system.

Thus compulsory arbitration necessitates a complete reconstruction of our notions of Trade Unionism. It ceases to be voluntary. It becomes a State created organisation of workmen to make claims against, or resist the claims of, a State created organisation of employers, both organisations in their rules, conduct, conditions of membership, being subject to a State created Court, which can give decisions without reference to the demands of either, and which can fine and confine Unions or members of Unions for breaches of an award. Thus, the State prescribes who may be members of a Union, how they are to be admitted, what Unions ought to be recognised, and what the relations of one Union to another ought to be. It also limits their activities. If the bricklayers, for instance, were injured by a strike of miners which in itself was legal, they could prevent the strike,

The newspaper reports of the Conference of 1907 show a marked advance in the opinions of the delegates. The Conference Committee—the body corresponding to the Parliamentary Committee of our Trade Union Congress—made certain criticisms on the action of the slaughtermen in their report. These were knocked out on a vote, and a sub-committee was appointed from the Conference to draw up a statement on the subject. The points made in the report of the sub-committee were:—That the law would never be administered in accordance with Labour opinion until there was an adequate representation of Labour in Parliament; that the Court was becoming more and more rigidly legal, and writs of attachment were now necessary to compel adherence to the law; that the effect of the law in encouraging Trade Unionism has not been so great as used to be supposed, and that by compelling the Unions to act in isolation it was hindering the development of a feeling of solidarity; that it is impossible to say how far the Court has been the prime cause of increased wages, but that the workers are not yet getting an adequate share in national prosperity and “there seems little likelihood of the “workers receiving any future increase in wages from the Arbitration “Courts”; that the law has not even partially solved the economic troubles of the wage-earning classes, and that the Court should be given powers to adjudicate on matters of interest, rent, and profit. Still, the Conference decided to adhere a little longer to the Act, but to rely more upon increased Labour representation than upon Arbitration Laws for an amelioration of the ills which the wage-earners bear.

Most of this is in direct contradiction to what has been said and written hitherto by the leaders of the Unions.

The value of the New Zealand method of establishing industrial peace and of securing to the worker a just share in the national income, therefore, seems to me to be very limited, and would be more limited here than there. It does not go to the root of the maldistribution of wealth; it hardly touches the mechanism of industrial relationships which determines how wealth once created is to be shared. Mr. Tregear, who, as custodian of Mr. Reeves' Act, has been its devoted advocate and has advised Governments as to its amendment, wrote in an official communication to Mr. Seddon on the 31st May, 1904:—“The general effect of the Act has been to benefit the “whole community, . . . such effects are, however, rapidly “becoming neutralised and soon only the empty shell of an apparent “prosperity will be left us if the unbridled covetousness of a few be “not regulated and checked.” Also, “The work of the Court is “being neutralised by malignant collateral action.” In a letter (which has since been published) to an American correspondent, Mr. Tregear wrote:—“We have barely touched the fringe of the soiled economic “garment.”

The machinery has indeed been admitted by everyone to have

broken down. But is it the machinery or the policy? I believe it is the policy. Any machinery will break down if it deals with superficial circumstances without going to the root causes. These roots remain active, and until they are cut will continue to throw up their growths of economic ills. The Government, however, are again trying to remodel the scheme, and a Bill is now before Parliament for that purpose. The Conciliation Boards are to be abolished and special Boards are to be appointed to deal with disputes after they have arisen, and the representatives are to be elected by the parties concerned, one half to represent the federated masters, the other half the men's Union. They are to dissolve so soon as the dispute is settled. When an industrial Union is fined and does not pay within a month, the members will be liable to a fine of £10 each. When a workman is fined, 25 per cent. of his wages may be attached until the amount is recovered. Unions of employers and employees may compel all masters or workmen in their trade within the district affected by an award to pay to their Unions subscriptions equal to the Union subscriptions, or to join the Unions. Only persons engaged in the trade can become officers of Unions.

Again, all one can say about such a proposal is that it is the inevitable outcome of the New Zealand Arbitration Law. Whether the workmen may conclude that the price they are called upon to pay for the benefits of arbitration is not too great remains to be seen. "The essential fact is," again to quote Mr. Clark, "that the present condition is unstable." This Bill, if carried, will make it still more unstable.

Time is short and swift; the evils of our present industrial system are great and press for treatment; Great Britain cannot afford to waste effort by experimenting with Arbitration Acts, which have to be altered drastically every now and again, and which require a complete readjustment of our relations between capital, labour, and the State, and which repel without routing existing economic evils—only to leave other avenues of attack open for them. "There is no evidence," is Mr. Clark's opinion, "to show that the average material condition of the working classes has been modified as yet by the laws enacted for them. The correction of individual instances of specific and acute abuse has little observable effect when distributed over the whole body of workers."

The other interesting experiment which our Australian kindred have made is that of Wages Boards. Instituted to put an end to sweating in a few trades, they have developed, like the New Zealand Arbitration Court, into an attempt to settle disputes and redistribute national income in trades that never were sweated. At first, they applied to six trades only—bootmaking, baking, clothing, furniture-making, and the making of shirts and underclothing—Boards for which were established on the 2nd November, 1896. Now there are 49 Boards, and the trades regulated by them include, in addition to the

above, cigar-making, slaughtering, dressmaking, fellmongering, iron-moulding, agricultural implement making, millinery, pottery making, printing, stonecutting, woodworking, and the woollen industry.

The Wages Board, with some minor differences, is a combination of the New Zealand Conciliation Board and Arbitration Court. It is a body composed in equal numbers of representatives of employers and employed, with an independent chairman. Up to 1905 the Boards were the final authority—except when the Minister had reason to believe that a determination would cause injustice, when he could suspend it and ask the Board to reconsider it; but in that year they were prohibited from fixing wages higher than the average paid by a reputable employer, and a Court of Industrial Appeals was established to which either side might take the Wages Boards' decision for review and revision. If the law remains in this condition, the Victorian Wages Boards, like the New Zealand Conciliation Boards, will cease to be important, and the Industrial Appeal Court will become the real tribunal for administering the law. When I was in Victoria at the end of 1906, three cases had been carried up to the Court, the most important being an appeal against a determination of the Artificial Manure Board to increase wages from 36s. to 40s. 6d. The Court decided that the old rate should be restored. But the most important of the appeals has been that against a decision of the Bakers' Board to increase wages. The Court again upset the decision, and restored the wages to their old figure. The men instantly struck—strikes not being illegal in Victoria*—the masters yielded, and the judge of the Court at once resigned on the ground that his position had become intolerable.

A careful examination of the effect of these Boards has hardly been made as yet. They were established when the industrial depression which clouded Victoria had reached its darkest limit in 1894-95. Wages were low; sweating was severe; the forces depressing labour were strong. The crisis led to a better organisation of capital, to an extension of the factory system, to a development of machinery, to more protection. When agriculture prospered owing to seasonable rains, and the prices of wool subsequently rose, the industrial tone of Victoria was tuned to a higher pitch. Confidence returned, business enterprise became bolder. The establishment of the Commonwealth increased the area of Free Trade, the Victorian markets expanded, some of the artificial industries of the other States gravitated towards Melbourne, and the inevitable upward bound came and was maintained. At the same time, drastic factory legislation increased the tendency to organise industry in an economical way, to make labour more effective, and to crush out forms of industry on a low economic level. Some of these changes were:—In 1893, the number of persons constituting a factory had been reduced to four, and, in 1896, the definition was

* The Wages Boards having been originally created to prevent sweating, have not the characteristic features of the New Zealand Arbitration Law—*i.e.*, the recognition of Trade Unions and the prevention of strikes and locks-out.

widened still further and the Public Health powers of inspectors enormously increased; old workplaces were condemned, hours of labour were restricted, women and children protected; workplaces, including houses where work was done, were registered and licensed; heavy penalties were imposed on employers for breaking these provisions. "I think," said one of the inspectors to me, "the Factory Law provisions for registration and sanitation have done quite as much as the Wages Boards to make Melbourne industry clean."

Thus, there was brought into play a concourse of economic forces, in which Wages Boards held a place amongst several others, making for higher prices, better work, and shorter hours. It is difficult to disentangle from the whole concourse any one force and assign to it its accurate value, but to attribute, as is commonly done, to Wages Boards and the fixing of legal standards of wages practically all this improvement, is certainly inaccurate.

One of the reasons why so little discrimination has been used hitherto in giving Wages Boards their proper relative value amongst the causes of increasing wages in Victoria has been the annual factory inspectors' reports. In these reports a list of trades under Wages Boards is given, with the average wages paid before the Boards were created and the average up-to-date. In these averages all kinds of wages, from those of foremen to those of apprentices, are lumped, and apparently no account is taken of broken time; and the suggestion—quite unwittingly conveyed, I am sure—is that the movement is due solely to Wages Boards. We have here a blend of a false statistical and economic method.

A careful study of these reports, however, affords sufficient warning to the investigator. Let me illustrate this by the figures supplied for the dressmaking trade, which is regulated by a Wages Board. The report for 1907 states that in 1903, before a Wages Board was established, the "average" weekly wage paid was 11s. 11d., whereas in 1906 it was increased by 11d. The increase was certainly not much. But further information follows:—"The average wage of adult females "has, however, risen from 18s. 8d. to 21s. 4d., being an average "increase of 2s. 8d. for each adult worker." The explanation of the first average is that in this trade there are now about twice as many juveniles as adults employed, and their ratio has increased in recent years. This is somewhat unsatisfactory. Why have the numbers of juvenile workers in this trade increased so much relatively to the adult workers that their apprenticeship wages, although raised nominally by the Wages Boards, have, when averaged with the adult increases, lowered them by 1s. 11d. per week? Mr. Rowe, the Bendigo inspector, answers:—"The employers complain against the "rate for the last two years (of the improvers' time), and I find that "there are very few girls employed after their third year." The increase in adult wages is therefore bought by an increase in the employment of unskilled juvenile labour—surely a very serious evil.

Nor is that the only kind of question raised by a study of this report. For in the notes supplied by the different inspectors under the report of each Board I find that upon dressmaking Mr. Hall writes as follows regarding the complaints of drapers that their dressmaking workrooms do not pay:—"I have no doubt in the world that the statement is "quite true, and the unfortunate forewomen are almost worried to "death in endeavouring to make the workrooms pay; but as they all "fail to succeed, it is evidently not their fault." Mr. Hall blames the cut-throat competition of the drapers for this state of things; but its existence shows how elusive are some of those industrial problems, and how, when apparently settled in one aspect, they only turn round and meet us in other directions.

Further, in 1904, when this Board was established, it seems that there was much more homework in this trade than there is now, and the average wage given for the previous year would be depressed accordingly. Now, factory legislation has made homework difficult, and the first average is, therefore, not for conditions similar to the second. The increase of 2s. 8d. in adult wages includes part, at any rate, of an increase which always follows when an industry becomes a factory industry,* and is therefore not all attributable to the Wages Board.

A detailed study of these annual factory inspectors' reports through a series of years reveals a curious instability in the figures of wages, which I can only account for by supposing that behind the figures are moving strong industrial forces—such as are seen quite plainly in this dressmaking case—discounting and readjusting the nominal improvements to labour. The same fluctuations are observable in the case of the furniture trade.

In trying to unravel from the mass of entangled evidence some clear idea of the effect of Wages Boards, one must first of all begin by dividing the problem into two sections. In the first place, what has been the effect of the Boards upon sweating and on wages paid to the disorganised workers—disorganised either because their work was carried on in a disorganised way, *i.e.*, homeworkers, or because they had defied all efforts to bring them into Trade Unions? In the second place, what has been the effect of Wages Boards upon the wages of factory and organised workmen?

The conditions of these two sections of workers are quite different from each other. The organised worker not only offers a steady pressure against reductions and in favour of increases, but vigilantly watches for breaches of agreements. He both demands and enforces favourable decisions.† Moreover, his work is definite, and though particular statements regarding it may be long and detailed, he under-

* In the report of 1907 it is stated that 4d. per hour is the wage paid in home dressmaking, which, on an eight hours' day, averages only 16s. per week.

† Here comes in the value of Unions, under the Wages Board system, as practised in Victoria. Unions complain, however, of the effect of the Boards on their organisation.

stands them and they are easily enforceable. These conditions do not exist in the sweated and disorganised trades. The Australian experience is that the enforcement of determinations in these trades is left to the factory inspectors. The happy-go-lucky assumption that if you fix a standard price for work every sweated woman will become alive to her own interest and protect it, is inspiring, but it is not sweated human nature. The idea that the sweated woman will see that she is paid her proper wages' rate is absurd, more particularly when she is working against machinery and when she can barely drag work out of its greedy and cheap clutches.

The Victorian Wages Boards were, as I have said, first of all anti-sweating Boards, and were applied to six trades. Now, taking the figures published in the last inspector's report (1907), we find that in these sweated trades the following movement in wages has taken place from first to last:—Boots, £1 3s. 2d., increased to £1 6s. 11d.; bread, £1 12s. 6d. to £2 2s. 8d.; clothing, £1 to £1 0s. 8d.; furniture, £1 9s. 1d. to £1 15s. 11d. (in one section of this trade, mantelpieces and overmantels, the average shows a decrease); shirts, 15s. 1d. to 16s.; underclothing, 11s. 3d. to 12s. 11d. After nine to eleven years of Board determinations (there was a little delay with some of the Boards) wages have been increased by 3s. 9d., 10s. 2d. (the only substantial increase, and this in a well organised trade), 8d., 6s. 10d., 11d., 1s. 8d. The more sweated the trade, the less has been the increase in its wages. It depends upon how strongly one is opposed to sweating whether one considers this result to be valuable or insignificant. To my mind it is not only insignificant; it is futile.

The evidence given to the Parliamentary Inquiry which investigated sweating in Melbourne in 1895 showed, however, that wages were then paid considerably below the average given in the factory inspectors' report, and so it is claimed for the Wages Board, in the words of a chairman of one of them:—"I admit they have not raised wages very much in these trades, but they have stopped the sweating which existed prior to their establishment." But here, again, the facts by no means bear out that absolute statement. Church-workers, Socialistic propagandists who had been carrying on a house to house visitation in the poorer parts of Melbourne, people interested generally in social conditions, informed me that sweating had not altogether disappeared. Some of it still eludes the inspectors, and the inspectors themselves admit that they cannot apply the determinations to the Chinese. "I have seen large bundles of clothing going out of factories to be made up by contractors who were evading Board determinations," writes Mr. Clark in the "*Labour Movement in Australasia*"—the book from which I have already quoted. Whenever there is the least collusion between workers and employers to evade the law, or the least fear or indifference on the part of the workers, the inspection and enforcement of wage standards are so difficult as to become impossible. A wages

standard is not like the state of a water closet or the dimensions of a room in which work is done. The one cannot be examined after it has been paid; the others can always be tested. Moreover, a wages standard is otherwise an uncertain thing. Is it to be for time or for piecework, or both? Is it to be for a week or for a year, and are periods of unemployment to be reckoned or not? What of new processes created by changing fashions? Are there to be two standards for the same work, according as it is done by hand or by machine? Where the middleman is either essential or profitable (*i.e.*, when he acts as a distributor of work) is his pay to come out of the workers' standard wages or from the profits of the original giver-out of the work? What should be the principle upon which wages in different trades vary? For instance, why should the milliner be paid £1 and the dressmaker 16s.? These are points in settling standards which have arisen in the Victorian experience, but which may be met in spite of difficulties. But what of enforcement in places like Whitechapel? How would the price lists of our existing Conciliation Boards be enforced if only a factory inspector and not a well-organised Union were behind them?

There is no doubt, however, that sweating is not carried on now in Melbourne to the same extent as in the "eighties." But here, again, we meet with the inadmissible claims of the advocates of Wages Boards. The area of sweating has not been diminished only because wages have been increased, but because the amended Factory Law made it illegal to give out work to be done at home unless the worker could produce a permit by the factory inspector. As the inspectors discourage homework as much as possible, this provision has been of the greatest benefit to the community. Sweating has been diminished not by an increase in wages, but by the destruction of its conditions by a Factory Act.

When we turn to the effect of Wages Boards on the price paid to organised labour, we come upon totally different ground, and are brought face to face with totally different problems. In some of the sweated industries we have examples of simple exploitation. When we know of articles being sold for 10s. or 15s. of which the cost of material may be about 5s., and which bear only a few pence as the cost of making them, everybody will agree that wages' rates might easily be raised without increasing cost to consumers, without altering greatly our existing mechanism of exchange. That, however, is hardly the case in factory industry. There profits rise and fall according to the state of markets and to the severity of competition, but rarely by a sweating exploitation of labour. Large profits are piled up not by selling with great profit margins on any one thing, but by selling many things on small profit margins. This comes about in accordance with the law of economy which is steadily moulding industrial organisation. According to this law the amount of the circulating medium called money becomes small in

relation to the volume of commodities for which it can be exchanged. This means low nominal wages but high real wages. Labour ought, therefore, to concentrate its attention upon real wages—the price of its necessities of life—rather than on nominal wages—the price of its labour power.

The effect of Wages Boards in factory labour, in so far as they do more to increase wages than can voluntary Conciliation Boards, is only to force up the price of labour power, and by that to heighten the standard of exchange all round and increase the dangers of foreign competition. Protection in some shape or form must inevitably follow, not only to preserve the home market but the foreign one as well, and the Protective wall must be so high as not only to prevent the foreigner coming over it and undercutting the producer for home needs, but to allow such producer sufficient profit on the home market to enable him to export a substantial amount of articles at prices lower than are paid for them by the home consumer. Applying a Wages Board to factory industry is like putting a penny in the slot of the Protective machine. Protectionists have then only to pull a handle and become possessed of their desired packet. Thus Labour places itself in the vicious circle of Protection with its nominal benefits but actual losses.

The nominal effect of Wages Boards in factory industry has been without doubt to increase wages, but as the Trade Unions have worked through the Boards one must be careful to discriminate so as to assign to them their just value over and above that which belongs to combined labour on a rising market. At any rate, I met no one of any importance in Victoria who believed that Wages Board rates could be as high as they are were it not for Protection. The redistribution of wealth therefore effected by Wages Boards is not the simple redistribution which follows increased wages, but the more complicated one which follows Protection. The workmen do not get full advantage of their increases, and when their wages are compared with those paid in similar industrial States—the United States, for instance—they do not appear to be specially high. High wages procured by Wages Boards under Protection is but part of a system of high exchange; high wages procured by Trade Unions under Free Trade mean that the workers are really getting a large share of the national produce.

A point suggests itself here, however. In some of our trades there are Conciliation Boards which discuss and settle wages and which tend to make distribution of wealth more equitable than it would otherwise be under our present system of production. These Conciliation Boards, however, do not cover complete trades. The best employers are in them, and the Trade Unionists are subject to their decisions. Outside are the low grade employers, the businesses managed uneconomically—the parasitical firms which manufacture paupers and unemployed, and which otherwise exist only in so far

as they are able to throw burdens upon society. When a voluntary Conciliation Board exists in a trade, and can fairly be accepted as representative of that trade, and when the Board has come to an agreement as to wages and conditions, why should not an application be made to some Court, or to the Home Office or Board of Trade, for an order to apply the agreement to the whole industry? The tribunal would require to have powers to vary the agreement, and it would have to hear evidence from the opposition. Trade Unions would require to allow themselves to become legal entities and would have to abandon the position from which they fought for the Trades Disputes Bill of 1906. Hitherto, I believe, they have considered that this proposal is not worth anything to them, that it would damage their organisation and would not, in the long run, benefit them very much. Therefore, their resolutions in favour of Wages Boards have as a rule been passed with the proviso that they did not mean to accept these Boards themselves. On the whole, I think they are right. But, on the other hand, the experience of both New Zealand and Australia goes to show that the fixing of wages by legal enactment is best done under factory conditions, and if that method were adopted here on the basis I suggest, it would not raise nominal prices and so develop into Protection, it would strengthen the position of well-organised factory industry and increase the force of the tendencies towards the concentration of capital and the efficiency of labour.

An economic system is like a machine. It can be speeded up, but only to a certain point. Beyond that it breaks down. An attempt to redistribute wealth by raising wages will be successful in reality, within a Free Trade area, by Trade Union methods and voluntary Conciliation Boards; it will be nominally successful for a time by compulsory arbitration and similar devices within a Protection area, but will ultimately break down because, to quote Mr. Tregear's words again, it will be "neutralised by malignant collateral action."

Nor must we forget in considering the value of these interesting experiments to this country, that Australasian conditions allow them more scope for beneficial action than our conditions do. These new countries are more democratic than we are; they are much smaller in population; their industrial organisation is much less complicated than is ours; simple human needs and rights make a more direct and imperative appeal to all classes in Australia than they do in our old and complicated society, whose slow growth and rigid organisation offer infinitely greater resistance to radical change. This comparative ease in organic change has a corresponding response in the minds of the people, and, more particularly, in those of the officials whose business it is to get into instinctive touch with the feeling of the society with which they experiment. Thus an Australian and New Zealand judge is far more likely to give decisions generous to labour than an English judge would—or, indeed,

could—do. I do not believe that there is a judge on the English Bench who, in the teeth of employers' opposition, would give increases of wages and reductions in hours in such a wholesale way as was given in Australasia when the arbitration and conciliation laws first came into operation. An organic type which has grown slowly and has a long history is in a state of much greater stability than one which has but recently come into being. Colonies allow a maximum effect to be derived from all kinds of legislation. Then, Protection enables arbitrators to give bold decisions, because, as one of the leading agricultural implement makers in Australia said to me in effect: "I am not afraid of ruin. If the industrial laws are too much for us, Mr. Deakin will give us some recompense"; and as the Australian producer as yet supplies his own market, his experiments are not only conducted within a very narrow field upon which a disaster is small and can be met without very great communal inconvenience, but he is the consumer of his own productions and can play with his exchanges as much as he likes.

What is the wise line of advance to secure a redistribution of wealth? There is but one, and it is a readjustment of economic relationships. Wealth is distributed in accordance with the working of the machine of production under our present system of ownership. Five million people own one half of our national income; thirty-eight million own the other half. The five million secure their incomes not by services rendered, but by their economic power to abstract values, owing to the fact that they own monopolies like land, and that they are allowed to supply the tools of labour which could be more economically supplied like gas and water by communal organisation. The Labour Party should not tinker with nominal wages, it should not dally with sweating and apply poultices to sores which have their causes deep-seated in a vitiated and poisoned system; it should not be diverted from going to the root of things and from its attempts to eliminate the useless parasitic classes. That is its natural and distinctive work. That is the only way to efface permanently sweating and the other evils which come from the economic weakness of great sections of our population. The Australasian experiments but touch the soiled hem of the garment. When begun they operate in an endless circle. Regulation of wages leads to regulation in prices. The Australian system is therefore Protection, Wages Boards, Prices Boards—more Protection, more Wages Boards, more Prices Boards—round and round and round, and in the end practically nothing has happened—except that a generation's effort has been wasted.

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.

THE GERMAN FLEET.

IT is curious that the Navy which has been built up with the least foresight and wisdom should be the one which has attracted most attention. Everywhere throughout the world the German Fleet has acquired an exaggerated importance. At this moment probably ninety-nine out of every hundred persons, if asked which was the next greatest Power after Great Britain, would instantly name Germany. Owing to her diplomatic methods, Germany has for years bulked largely in the popular imagination, and the fact that successive Naval Acts down to the latest one of this year have been discussed in the Reichstag, and finally passed, has been regarded as evidence of a progressive and successful naval policy. The result is that Germany has gained a reputation for naval power which her fleet, as it exists to-day, does not justify. Taking into consideration all the factors which must be considered in estimating the relative strength of the nations of the world, probably Germany ranks above France as the third greatest naval Power. Great Britain, of course, heads the list, and then undoubtedly comes the United States, which in the last year or two has outstripped the navies of the Continent of Europe. The lead which has been obtained by the United States is probably greater actually than can be shown by any array of statistics, because in not a few of the European navies the fighting efficiency of the national sea forces has been adversely affected by anti-military tendencies, and by that sense of "slackness" which so frequently assails the fighting man during days of peaceful dalliance. Germany may be placed above France in the order of precedence, not because she possesses more ships or better ships, but because the naval *régime* in the German fleet is more efficient. The grim steel discipline of the German army dominates also the fleet. The navy is manned by sea soldiers rather than by sailors of the old types which are still found in countries with long seaboard and large seafaring populations. Germany is, to a great extent, shut away from the sea, and her

fleet is manned largely with landsmen. Whatever they may lack in general handiness in ordinary sailor-like duties, they are well disciplined, and reach a high standard of efficiency on the mechanical side; they handle guns and torpedoes skilfully, and adapt themselves with splendid results to the conditions of life in engine-room and boiler-room. They possess in a marked degree the technique required in a modern war fleet, and from the admiral in command to the rawest hand the whole force is inspired by devotion to the flag and the Emperor.

The strength of the German fleet lies rather in the character of its officers and men—though even this factor is frequently exaggerated—than in the number or power of the ships of war. Whereas France possesses more ships and better ships, the *personnel* has for years past suffered owing to the political unrest which has afflicted the country, and which has nowhere had more serious results than in the naval arsenals and in the ships at sea. There is warrant for placing the German fleet as the third greatest navy of the world, and above that of France, solely owing to the high efficiency in warlike duties revealed by German officers and men. Man is still superior to his instruments of warfare. Never has this been illustrated more conclusively than by the comparatively recent story of the downfall of Russia as a naval Power. It would be an act of depreciation to place the French on a level with the Russian ships which were driven off the seas by the Japanese fleet, but, at the same time, no one who is acquainted with the two national forces can doubt that in all which contributes to success in naval war the Germans hold a position in Europe which is very much higher than that of other Continental nations. The German *personnel* is strong, dominantly strong, and contrasts very favourably, all points considered, with other fleets of Continental European Powers; but it is weak, glaringly weak, in comparison with the *personnel* and *matériel* resources of Great Britain.

In ships this deficiency is particularly notable. Ever since Germany embarked upon the task of creating a great fleet she has continually, to use a colloquialism, "side-slipped." The mistakes have arisen from two causes. In the first place, the German naval authorities, ten years ago, when the first Naval Act was passed, formed a very low opinion of the efficiency of neighbouring fleets, not excluding that of Great Britain; and they came to the conclusion that with fewer ships and smaller ships, drilled to the standard of warlike efficiency of the German army ashore, they could produce a fighting force, in the Baltic and in the North Sea, which would be able to hold its own in the probable political circumstances of the immediate future. This conclusion was all the more welcome because at that period the naval authorities could not count upon very generous appropriations from the Reichstag for the building up of a new fleet. In the past Germany had cut but a small figure at sea, and relying upon her military power,

had been content to confine her activities afloat to the provision of a weak force of coast defence ships and a few torpedo craft. These vessels were built purely for coastal service, with storages of coal so limited as to render it impossible for them to proceed far from a base. When the idea of a sea-going fleet first took shape, the German authorities measured their absolute requirements not by the size and "paper-power" of the men-of-war of neighbouring nations, the warlike efficiency of which they regarded with ill-concealed contempt, but by the little ships which had hitherto served their purpose—ships with fairly heavy armaments for their size, slow speed, and restricted radius of action. It was thought that a sufficiently powerful fleet could be obtained if in the new ships greater provision were made to enable them to keep the seas and a higher rate of steaming were secured. Owing to the reluctance exhibited by the German peoples to incur heavy expenditure upon the fleet, the German Admiralty set about the creation of a naval force which should exactly fit the political circumstances and the financial and naval situation of the hour, and they cut their coat according to the cloth—in fact, they left a good deal of cloth over owing to the low opinion which they had formed of the efficiency of rival fleets. From the very first it was determined to provide a fleet as cheaply as possible, and to make up for any inferiority of *matriel* by the superiority of *personnel*. The thought which lay behind the successive Naval Acts passed since 1898 may be summed up in the following quotation from the measure of 1900:—

"As, even after the projected increase has been carried out, the number of vessels of the German Navy will still be more or less inferior to that of other individual great Powers, our endeavours must be directed towards compensating for this superiority by the individual training of the crews and by tactical training by practice in large bodies."

In other words, the German ambition was to provide a small navy, but one markedly superior in warlike efficiency to any then existing. Thus it came about that Germany built the fleet as it exists to-day, a fleet which, month by month, the German authorities have been led by the action of rival Powers to regard with increasing dissatisfaction. German naval policy was based upon the continuance of the comparative inefficiency of neighbouring naval Powers. What has happened? Since the first German Navy Bill was passed, it has acted as an irritant in Europe at least. It has engendered a spirit of emulation, particularly in the British and American fleets, and has left the German peoples with a fleet altogether out of proportion to the naval forces of Great Britain and the United States, and far less comparatively efficient than was hoped would be the case ten years ago. This has been due not to the failure of German naval officers

and men to rise to the idea upon which German naval expansion was based, but to the impetus to a higher standard of naval training which the very hopes of Germany created elsewhere, and particularly in the British fleet. Germany supplied the Powers of the world with a tonic when she let it be known that her naval experts had formed a poor opinion of the fighting fitness of other fleets. The very announcement that the German navy intended to compensate for inferior *matériel* by the superiority of the German *personnel* gave rise to a competition in efficiency in place of a meaningless race in ship-building which had been going on for many years previously. Germany reminded the world that man is still superior to the machine which he controls, and thus, by revealing so openly the basic thought which inspired her experts, she aroused neighbours and rivals, in varying degree, from the lethargy which had crept over them during the long-continued years of slothful peace.

Since the first Act was passed the German naval authorities have been busy in trying to undo the initial mistake, which was committed in the full belief that the inefficiency of rival naval forces of ten years ago would continue. The sequence of events is interesting. In 1898 an Act—the first of the series—was passed, which made provision for expenditure on the fleet for seven years, and the measure thus came to be known as the Septennate. While in 1873 the expenditure upon the German Navy amounted to £1,300,000, and even in 1888 had only risen to two and a half millions sterling, under this Act the outlay for 1898 was fixed at five and three-quarter millions, and provision was made for a gradual increase until the maximum was reached in 1904, when it was proposed that £7,327,818 should be spent. During these seven years it was intended to raise the strength of the active fleet to seventeen battleships, eight coast defence ships, and nine large and twenty-six small cruisers, besides torpedo craft, entailing a total expenditure of £23,500,000. On the continued assumption that naval inefficiency in other countries would still continue, authority was given for the building of small battleships, ships of just under 11,000 tons displacement, carrying a main armament of four 9.4 inch guns of 40 calibres, and at the same time appropriations were made for reconstructing the old so-called battleships of the *Baden* class, of 7,283 tons. These new battleships were smaller and less powerful in offence than the vessels at that time being built for the British, French, Italian, and Japanese navies; but Germany, in her pride, calculated that this inferiority would be more than compensated for by the high standard of naval efficiency to which it was intended the German crews should attain. This Act should have run for seven years, but within about eighteen months of its passage it was evident that it had been a costly mistake. It was forthwith decided to abandon it, or in other words, to substitute for it another measure more costly, and better calculated to provide the German Empire

with a navy more nearly corresponding to the newly-aroused ambitions of the German peoples.

Consequently the programme of 1898 was replaced in 1900 by another Act. Under this measure the total battleship strength to be eventually provided was doubled, and at the same time the size, and consequently also the cost, of battleships and cruisers was increased. The new organisation adopted under the Act of 1900 was to consist of two double squadrons of battleships, each comprising eight vessels, excluding the flagship of the admiralissimo, four divisions of four cruisers each, and four torpedo flotillas comprising forty-eight boats. In addition to this active fleet of seventeen battleships, sixteen cruisers, and forty-eight torpedo craft, provision was made for a reserve formation numerically similar, but with only a small number of ships in full commission. Elaborate details were set out, specifying year by year the number of new vessels to be laid down, and the units which would automatically pass into the reserve fleet; and the other, even older, ships which would be put aside as of no further service. This Act also provided for the expansion of the *personnel* to the necessary dimensions, and for the extension of dockyard and administrative machinery. It was the most exact and complete legislative enactment for naval expansion which had ever been adopted in any country. It was methodical and precise to the last degree, and was to cover a period of seventeen years, namely, from the year 1900 to 1916 inclusive. The intention was that, in 1916, a continuation Bill should be introduced, containing a new shipbuilding programme, and making provision for completing the last ships begun under the Act of 1900. In effect, the German Navy Act of 1900 proposed to double the effective strength of the navy, while at the same time making provision for an increase in the size of battleships and cruisers. The whole organisation was to be raised from the standard of 11,000 ton battleships to that of 13,000 ton battleships, and authority was given for all the necessary adjustments of the naval machine. In view of the active outcry in several foreign countries against a further increase in the size of battleships and cruisers, the German authorities considered that their own expansion to a standard battleship displacement of 13,000 tons would prove ample.

Once more they exhibited lack of foresight. At the moment when the Act of 1900 was passed, other fleets were being strengthened by ships of 15,000 tons; and almost immediately after the passage of the German Act through the Reichstag authorising larger German ships—vessels of 13,000 tons displacement—the naval authorities of other countries took a step forward, and in Great Britain, Russia, the United States, and Japan provision was made for ships exceeding the old standard size of about 15,000 tons, which had become general. In spite of the naval movement in other countries, the German authorities continued on their course, pressing forward the construc-

tion of their battleships of moderate dimensions and their comparatively small armoured cruisers. Then occurred the war in the Far East, and even before it had been concluded Great Britain had designed the *Dreadnought*, of upwards of 18,000 tons service displacement, and Japan had put in hand two battleships of even greater size. The increase in displacement was the least important feature of these new ships. It soon became known that skilled observers of the battles in the Far East had decided that the secondary battery of 6-inch guns, hitherto mounted in the battleships of practically all nationalities, was ineffective in battle, owing to the increased efficiency of the torpedo in preventing large ships closing to a range enabling these rapid fire guns to be employed against armour. From every hand reports came of projects for building huge battleships of the *Dreadnought* type, vessels mounting eight to ten 12-inch pieces of 45 or 40 calibres, and devoid of all secondary armament, but provided with a large number of small quick-firing weapons for repelling torpedo attack.

No navy in the world suffered more by this change of opinion as a result of the war than that of Germany. The German battleships under construction, in accordance with the Act of 1900, were planned specially for the development of the condemned secondary armament. For years the 9.4-inch gun of 40 calibres (in place of the British 12-inch) had been retained in the German Fleet as the primary armament of battleships, in order to utilise the weight thus saved for the mounting of a secondary armament of 6-inch guns, 50 per cent. more numerous than in contemporary foreign ships. Whereas British battleships were being provided with four 12-inch guns and twelve 6-inch pieces, and the same policy was being followed with some variations in the United States and other navies, Germany was content to place in each of her battleships four 9.4-inch guns, with a particularly heavy armament of eighteen 6-inch weapons. Expert observers of the war in the Far East, when they came to the conclusion that the 6-inch gun was ineffective for battle, condemned the constructive policy of the German naval authorities. They had devoted themselves to the development of a heavy secondary armament, at the expense of the primary weapons, whereas the war had shown that the primary weapons should be developed at the expense of the secondary armament.

A suspicion of the coming revolution in constructive policy led to a slight variation of the German design in 1902, when four 11-inch guns were substituted for the 9.4-inch weapons hitherto carried, and in place of the eighteen 6-inch pieces it was decided to mount fourteen guns of 6.7 inches. In spite of this slight change of policy the German naval authorities found their handiwork condemned by the experience of war, as from all quarters they received reports of the activity of other Powers—Japan, Russia, the United States, and

Great Britain—in the design of huge battleships of the *Dreadnought* type.

At last the trend of events compelled the German Naval Secretary, Admiral Tirpitz, to lay an amending Act before the Reichstag in 1906, increasing the size of the battleships from 13,000 to 19,000 tons—a jump of 6,000 tons—and raising the displacement of the armoured cruisers to 15,000 tons. This was an extraordinary *volte-face*, which carried with it condemnation of all the battleships built under the Acts of 1898 and 1900. At the same time opportunity was taken to increase the number of armoured cruisers, so as to provide additional vessels for foreign service, and to authorise the construction of a larger number of mosquito craft. The war in the Far East had revealed the importance of torpedo boat destroyers for offensive purposes in deep waters. The German authorities had no difficulty in obtaining authorisation for the increased programme. The amending Act was a complete condemnation of those which had preceded it, and had been based upon illusory hopes as to the superiority of the German *personnel* in war training over the officers and men of other fleets, and on the value of small guns.

By embarking upon the construction of one-big-gun ships, Germany has admitted her mistake in building so many vessels without big guns, but with a large number of pieces of small power. The course of naval opinion in Germany, and the repeated errors due to over-confidence in German war training and depreciation of the efficiency of rivals, cannot be indicated better than by a summarised statement of the German Fleet of battleships, as it had been built up from year to year, commencing with the oldest effective vessels:—

Class.	No. of ships.	Displacement.	Guns.	
<i>Kaiser</i>	5	11,000	4 9'4 in.	18 6 in.
<i>Wittelsbach</i>	5	11,500	4 9'4 in.	18 6 in.
<i>Braunschweig</i>	5	13,000	4 11 in.	14 6'7 in.
<i>Deutschland</i>	5	13,000	4 11 in.	14 6'7 in.
<i>Bayern</i> *	4	18,000	14 11 in.	none.

* The first one to be launched this month.

It will be seen that in the latest type of battleship the 6-inch and the 6.7-inch guns have entirely disappeared, in accordance with the views which have found acceptance in the British, American, French, and Japanese navies. Germany has just commenced the construction of four of these big ships, *but for two years to come her fleet will include no battleship of greater displacement than 13,000 tons.* Sir William White, the late Director of British Naval Construction, has laid it down as an axiom that displacement may be accepted as a fair index of fighting power between contemporary vessels. It may not be a complete and wholly satisfactory method of calculating relative naval strength, but it is sufficiently exact for general purposes, and gives a very fair indication of fighting power.

The extent to which the German Fleet has gained an exaggerated importance may be shown by a few figures. For about two years to come, that is, until the first specimens of the latest and largest type of battleship pass into the German Fleet, it will consist of ten ships of 13,000 tons, each carrying four 11-inch guns and fourteen 6.7-inch guns, and in addition it will include ten other ships of between 11,000 and 12,000 tons, each mounting only four 9.4-inch guns and eighteen 6-inch guns. These twenty battleships, ten of which are less powerfully armed than many contemporary British cruisers, will constitute the German battle fleet during the next two years. All these ships are not yet ready for sea, but the last of them are nearing completion. Weak in gun fire, as judged by the latest standard, they are, however, well armoured, and possess a fair speed. The best of them could just cross from Wilhelmshaven to New York at a moderate rate of steaming, and would then arrive off the American coast with their bunkers empty—and no ship can go into action unless she has a large reserve of coal on hand. In this connection it may be mentioned that Germany does not possess an auxiliary fleet of colliers, which would enable her to coal these ships during a long voyage. In fact, until some efficient system of coaling ships on the high seas has been evolved, the German Navy can take no action outside the waters immediately adjacent to the German Empire. No German admiral would think of taking any of the existing battleships more than a thousand miles or so from Wilhelmshaven, owing to the necessity of always keeping in hand sufficient fuel for the return voyage, which might have to be made in time of war at full speed in the attempt to escape from a superior force of an enemy. Full speed, of course, leads to extravagant expenditure of coal, and for this reason the anticipation is expressed that these ships will never be sent in time of war more than a thousand miles distant from Wilhelmshaven.

Such is the German Fleet as it will exist during the next two years. For action in the seas near at hand it is, of course, of considerable importance, but unit by unit it compares badly with the contemporary ships which will be in service in the British Fleet during the next two years. By the spring of 1909 the British Navy will include four *Dreadnoughts*, battleships of 18,000 tons, in addition to the three *Dreadnought* cruisers of 17,250 tons displacement each, with the same broadside fire of eight 12-inch guns as the *Dreadnought* battleships. These latter men-of-war are those in which a certain measure of armour protection has been sacrificed in order to obtain a higher rate of steaming. The *Dreadnoughts* have an actual sea speed of 21 knots, whereas the three contemporary battleship-cruisers have been built for a rate of steaming of upwards of 25 knots an hour. These seven ships will be in commission within less than a year; and in addition the British Fleet will then comprise the two *Lord Nelson* battleships of 16,500 tons and the eight *King Edward VII's* of

16,350 tons, besides twenty-eight vessels ranging from 13,000 to 15,000 tons, the two battleships *Swiftsure* and *Triumph*, of 11,800 tons each, which were purchased from Chile four years ago, and a number of obsolescent vessels. When it is added that, in comparison with the German battleships, each of the eight *King Edward VII.*'s battleships carries four 12-inch guns and four 9.4-inch guns as its main armament; that the two *Lord Nelson* ships possess four 12-inch and ten 9.2-inch guns each; and that each of the seven *Dreadnoughts* will have a broadside of eight 12-inch guns of 45 calibres, sufficient statistical data will have been provided to enable even the most casual reader to understand that during this period the British Fleet will be more than three times as strong as that which Germany will be able to put to sea.

The bearing of these facts has not been lost upon the German naval authorities, although it was only as recently as 1906 that an amending Act was passed. This measure was heralded as the final word in naval expansion, but for many weeks past the Reichstag has had under consideration a further amending law. In summary, this new proposal provides for the hastening of the construction of battleships. It makes provision for the fleet down to the year 1917, but in view of the variations which have occurred in the past, it will be sufficient to take into consideration the programmes of construction for the next three years, when it is intended to lay down the following men-of-war, the total naval estimates in each year being appended:—

Year.		Total Estimate.
1908	3 <i>Dreadnoughts</i> , 1 <i>Invincible</i> , 2 Protected Cruisers, 12 Destroyers	£16,600,000
1909	3 <i>Dreadnoughts</i> , 1 <i>Invincible</i> , 2 Protected Cruisers, 12 Destroyers	£20,000,000
1910	4 <i>Dreadnoughts</i> , 2 Protected Cruisers, 12 Destroyers	£23,000,000

These proposals will result in a very great increase in the German Fleet, since under the Act of 1906 4 *Dreadnoughts* and 1 *Invincible* are already in hand. There is every reason for not considering the programme of construction of later years, because there is an impression that in 1910 Admiral Tirpitz, the Naval Secretary, will propose further amending Naval Acts, so as to make provision for a still more rapid expansion of the fleet. It is possible to take too long a view in naval affairs, and the history of the naval movement in Germany should be sufficient warning against indulging in prophetic excursions and alarms. Sufficient for the day is the German naval programme thereof, and the nature of the proposals for the next three years is sufficient to cause anxious thought without indulging in speculation as to what will come after.

What influence will this accelerated German shipbuilding have upon the position of the British Fleet? In the first place, this country, in common with Japan, has gained a lead in the construction of ships embodying the *Dreadnought* principles of armament and armour protection. Apart from the two *Lord Nelsons*, which are as much *Dreadnoughts* as the six ships authorised in France, of which we have heard so much, we have at this moment seven *Dreadnought* ships either complete or completing, and three others have just been begun, which will be at sea two years hence. What, on the other hand, is the position of Germany? At the present moment she has not launched a single ship of the *Dreadnought* type. The first five vessels (4 *Dreadnoughts* and 1 *Invincible*) were begun last year, and they will not be ready to be commissioned before late in the year 1910. Consequently in the spring of 1911, when the British Fleet will comprise seven *Dreadnoughts*, two *Lord Nelsons*, and three *Invincible* cruisers, the German Fleet will have four *Dreadnoughts* and one *Invincible* cruiser, provided that the construction of these German ships is not further delayed. In view of the immense superiority of the British Fleet in armoured vessels of earlier design, there is nothing immediately alarming in this outlook.

This is a sane, statesmanlike view of the situation, and that it is not open to reproach may be judged from the following quotation from the "Army and Navy Gazette" of November 30 last, giving the strictly naval view of the naval outlook:—

"So far as battleships and armoured cruisers are concerned, she (Germany) has, on the very best showing, for that ten years' expenditure (1897-1907) only five moderately efficient vessels, the *Deutschlands*, of a little over 13,000 tons. For our expenditure in the same ten years we have to show eight *King Edwards*, of over 16,000 tons, two *Lord Nelsons*, of 16,500 tons, and one *Dreadnought*, of 17,900 tons. Practically, our armoured cruisers of similar date are a match for all their older battleships, and in our estimate we propose to eliminate both these classes of vessels. Moreover, we shall place on one side the eight *Implacables* and five *Duncans*, with the *Triumph* and *Swiftsure*, fifteen battleships, to be thrown into the scale against any second Power if necessary. The actual position, then, is eleven British battleships, all over 16,000 tons, to the five *Deutschlands* of 13,000 tons.

"Turning to the ships on the stocks, or completing, we have the three *Téméraires* and the three *Invincibles*, six vessels to be placed against the four German battleships (*Dreadnoughts*) and the one armoured cruiser (*Invincible*), which have been ordered in 1907. Assuming, then, that they will build as fast as, or even little faster, than we do, and that all these ships are effective in 1909, we shall then have sixteen battleships and big armoured cruisers to meet their ten vessels. In 1908 our *St. Vincents* will have been begun, and presumably the three German battleships and one big cruiser which will now be authorised, so that in 1910 the proportion will stand at twenty to fifteen, or if the

Deutschlands are then omitted, as may well be the case, at twenty to ten. Of course, in assuming that Germany can build as fast as we can, we are making an assumption unwarranted by anything yet experienced, but our aim has been to picture the circumstances in the worst possible light to this country. Surely there is nothing in the actual facts that we need contemplate with alarm."

In view of all the circumstances of the situation, there is every reason why the British naval authorities should refuse to be dragooned into a large programme of naval construction in the present year. One *Dreadnought* battleship will meet the requirements of the situation, leaving the Admiralty free to take what further action may be deemed necessary next year, when it will be possible for them to judge the progress being made in Germany, and they will have exact knowledge of the designs of the new German ships. More money has been wasted in laying down ships in a hurry during periods of panic than it would be pleasant for British taxpayers to recall.

A close examination shows that an exaggerated view has been taken of the strength of the German Fleet. It comprises at present, and will comprise during the next two years, ships of altogether inferior fighting capacity, and vessels which, moreover, owing to their restricted coal capacity, cannot be used outside European waters. Even at the end of three years the expansion of the German Navy will have made less progress than seems to be generally anticipated. A naval organisation which has been built up to suit a standard battleship of 13,000 tons, an organisation including docks, harbours, and the Kiel Canal, cannot speedily be expanded to suit an organisation based upon a standard battleship of about 19,000 tons. The tasks of increasing the size of the Kiel Canal, enlarging docks, and deepening harbours, will probably not be completed for five or six years at least.

But, relatively weak as the German Fleet is at present, the plans which are now maturing will ensure it a significant and prominent position about 1912 and onwards. Provision has been made for carrying this work of naval expansion on from year to year swiftly and persistently, and when the task is completed about 1920, and Germany possesses a fleet of twenty-two *Dreadnoughts* and eleven *Invincibles*, with a large number of small cruisers and torpedo craft, she will occupy a position on the seas which will render her naval power a factor of immense importance. Many moons, however, will rise and wane before this climax is reached, and while rival Powers will not fail to take account of the progress made in carrying out this scheme, they will not accept this great fleet as an accomplished fact merely because the project has been drawn up and endorsed by the Reichstag. In the course of twelve years many events—financial, economic or political—may happen to disturb these ambitious pro-

posals, and in the circumstances political students will not complain of the action of the British authorities in keeping their hands free to take from year to year such measures in the matter of shipbuilding as the actual circumstances of each succeeding period, in view of our unrivalled resources for quick and cheap building, may render advisable. Germany has paid dearly for her attempt to forecast the trend of naval policy in elaborate programmes, spread over many years. Her failures will be the danger signals of other Powers, and her ambitions, as they reach fruition step by step, and from year to year, will give the necessary impetus to naval expansion in the United Kingdom. It appears inevitable on the present indications that we must prepare for laying down four or five *Dreadnoughts* in 1909. But, in spite of all the excursions and alarms, Germany will, no doubt, continue to possess only the third greatest navy of the world, even when—and if—her plans have matured.

THE CHARM OF FRENCH VERSE.

THE peculiar quality of charm in the best French lyrical poetry, the quality of charm which distinguishes it from the lyrical poetry of other races, is a subtle and an exquisite thing, and the feeling for it is rare. This feeling the French themselves lost in the age of Voltaire, and they did not fully regain it until the age of Verlaine. We lost it in the age of Lydgate, and when we recovered somewhat of it, in the age of Wordsworth, we did so without knowing very clearly what we were doing. Indeed, I doubt if we know very clearly even now. Our most original poets of the younger generation, and especially Mr. Robert Bridges and Mr. W. B. Yeats, seem to me to be aiming at a venture at an unseen mark. They perceive that Mr. Swinburne has developed and exhausted the possibilities of the purely English tradition of poetic style, with its clanging alliterative harmony, its tumultuous imagery and its gorgeous picturesqueness; they perceive this, but they are still rather obscurely feeling their way to a style with qualities entirely different. Mr. Robert Bridges, it is true, has returned to the ideas of Chaucer; but he does not appear to recognise completely that the ideas of Gower and Chaucer are, like the ideas of Wordsworth, French ideas.

The revolution in the matter of diction which Wordsworth began, but did not carry through, was based upon a distinction between art and inspiration as fine as it was profound. The fact is that there is little pure poetry even in the works of the greatest poets. The art of verse, as Shelley remarked, consists chiefly in connecting the spaces between the flashes of inspiration by an intertexture of rhetoric. This intertexture may be beautifully spun and choicely adorned, as in "Paradise Lost," or it may be loosely and badly woven, as in the "Excursion"; but this, in itself, does not make the first work a better model of pure poetry than the second. As a matter of fact, the formal eloquence used by Milton in the tracts of verse between his inspired passages was the source of much of the stilted diction which, in the eighteenth century, clogged the powers of self-expression of Thomson and Gray. From the influence of this diction Wordsworth escaped by writing, with extraordinary sincerity,

in the flattest manner possible, between his outbursts of "high and "passionate thought to its own music chanted." When, to take an instance selected by Mrs. Meynell, he could not compose a strain of true poetry informed by its own beauty, such as Shakespeare's:

"The summer's flower is to the summer sweet,
Though to itself it only live and die,"

he refrained at least from elaborating magniloquence of a false kind, such as Gray's:

"Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

Wordsworth held to the first principle of great poetry, which consists in sheer sincerity of expression; but he did not develop it. Had he done so, he would have recognised that there was a delightful middle way, in regard to the intertexture of verse, between the rhetorical manner and the prosaic. He would have found that this middle way had been followed by all the best French poets, from Benoit de Sainte-More and Chrestien de Troyes to Racine and La Fontaine, and that it had been adopted by Nicholas of Guildford and Chaucer, who thereby arrived at the only perfect model of a clear, bright, sound, and fine medium of poetic expression existing in English literature.

French verse of the best sort is distinguished by a Doric delicacy of style. It does not dazzle; it does not startle. It has little vehemence of passion, little splendour of imagination. Its charm resides in an intimacy and a fineness of feeling which gain upon one very gradually, and impress one at last very deeply. The emotions which inform it are commonly emotions recollected in a tranquil, lucid frame of mind, and defined with an unusual faculty for analytical introspection. The French poet seldom surrenders himself to his intuitions and builds wholly upon these. He is strangely reasonable, and never more so, perhaps, than when, as in the last of his literary movements, he strains at the fantastic, and tries to follow little irregularities by rule. The road to his imagination always runs through his intellect. This, of course, is a grand characteristic of the genius of his race generally. A French cathedral of the best period may make on the soul of a romantic visitor an effect of ineffable awe and mystery; but the means by which this effect is produced are really an expression of an extremely acute sense of logical construction. A French cathedral is different in character from an English cathedral. It is animated by the same austere spirit as that which animates a theological system by Calvin, or a psychological drama by Racine, the spirit of clarity, order, logic.

The course of the French genius is to make wonders plain, and not to make plain things wonders. The kind of sublimity at which it aims in its highest poetry is a sublimity so familiar, so touching, and so simple that everyone is inclined at first to fancy that he could have found it himself without trouble. The diction of French verse of the finest sort is not, therefore, what Wordsworth called "a poetic diction." Instead of the ornateness, force and heightened tone of the grand style, it possesses the simplicity, the ease and the naturalness, and, above all, the indefinable grace of manner of courtly speech. It is "a selection of the real language of men," in Wordsworth's famous phrase, or, in Corneille's equally memorable definition, "*la conversation des honnêtes gens*." Its chief virtue is its transparency. Nothing in it is very richly coloured; everything is finely shaded in diaphanous tints.

"Prends l'éloquence, et tords-lui son cou,"

said Verlaine,

"Car nous voulons rien que la nuance,
Pas la couleur, la nuance encor."

And along with this transparency of style there goes an incomparably aerial lightness of music. To quote again from Verlaine, who, in this and in other matters, recovered, apparently by mere fineness of ear, ancient traditions of French verse lingering only in folk-song, or hidden away in dusty collections of mediæval poetry:

"De la musique encore et toujours!
Que ton vers soit la chose envolée,
Qu'on sent qui fuit d'une âme en allée
Vers d'autres cieux, à d'autres amours.

"Que ton vers soit la bonne aventure
Eparse au vent crispé du matin,
Qui va fleurant la menthe et le thym.
Et tout le reste est littérature."

It is a common mistake to regard French poetry as a thing of very formal harmonies. It really contains the most varied measures "ever moulded by the lips of man." If it has a defect, this defect is not that it is too formal, but that it is too lawless. Its inner melody is the freest in any poetry. It floats above the rhythm of the numbered syllables with as wild a sweetness as the elfin note of a blackcap's song floats above the measured murmur of a woodland stream. The secondary accent in French verse is very light and

irregular, and its position in the ordered array of words changes with the flow of poetic feelings and marks their wayward course. Its lightness makes for an aerial quality of music; its irregularity for an inexhaustible wealth of rhythmical combinations. It frequently fails to coincide with the primary accent that falls on the last sonorous syllable of words, and it is this disagreement which endows the French language with its unrivalled suppleness and variety.

These peculiar advantages, however, entail peculiar disadvantages. French blank verse is not verse at all, as M. Maeterlinck and other modern experimenters in new rhythms have sadly discovered. The unstable French accents cannot by themselves, however skilfully they are placed, give to French poetry the structure which distinguishes it from prose. The fetters of rhyme are necessary to this end, and few writers, except La Fontaine, have been able safely to dispense with the additional aid and encumbrance of a regular metre. On the other hand, what a countless number of delicate variations in tone and rhythm a great French poet can produce with that most hackneyed of rhymed measures, the Alexandrine! Racine, to my mind, is the master enchanter. I agree with all that Mr. J. C. Bailey says of the genius of La Fontaine, in his admirable illuminating work on "The Claims of French Poetry," just published by Messrs. Constable and Co. There is no poet more generally agreeable than the author of the inimitable "Fables." La Fontaine appeals to everybody: to those happiest of mortals, children, with their unspoilt taste for the very best of stories; to the rather disillusioned student of the human comedy, with a relish for gay irony; and to the fastidious amateur of the finer delicacies of literature. He has a wonderfully easy command of styles of very diverse character. His picture of Aurora,

" Par de calmes vapeurs mollement soutenue,
Sa tête sur son bras, et son bras sur la nue,
Laisant tomber des fleurs, et ne les semant pas,"

has the *morbidesse* of a painting by Corregio. His sketches of

" Les forêts, les eaux, les prairies,
Mères des douces rêveries,"

with here and there a quiet shadowed river,

" Image d'un sommeil doux, paisible, et tranquille,"

are landscapes seen, like those of Corot, across a tenderly poetic temperament. And with what a grandly romantic effect he introduces

into the midst of a description of a fashionable dinner party his conception of a sea-monster,

" assez vieux pour lui dire
Tous les noms des chercheurs de mondes inconnus
Qui n'en étaient pas revenus,
Et que depuis cent ans sous l'abîme avaient vus
Les anciens du vaste empire! "

Yet, though I am ready to allow that the work of La Fontaine is supremely charming within its well-defined limits, I would not rank him, in a general way, with Racine. Fine as his verse is, it lacks the magic of the long, silvery, soft and thrilling violin tones of the prince of French poets. And Racine's diction! There is nothing in English literature remotely analogous to it, except, perhaps—it is a strange comparison, I admit—the diction of Newman's earliest and best prose, the prose of the "Parochial Sermons." It has scarcely any colour, scarcely any ornament, or abrupt, violent movement. Even lines with a brilliant point, such as that in "Mithridate,"

" N'en attendez jamais qu'une *paix sanguinaire*,"

are uncommon. In the austerity of Racine's style there is reflected somewhat of the spirit of the rigorous teachers who seized his youth,

" And purged its flame, and trimmed its fire,"

the great religious reformers of Port Royal, the companions of Pascal. But beneath the apparent monotony of his poetry there is a life as intense as that subsisting beneath the apparent monotony of Newman's prose, and it is revealed in the same subtle way, by an infinitely varied, delicate and expressive gradation of rhythm. Racine breaks up his Alexandrines into phrases as flowing and melodious as those of Lamartine. For instance, his son, Louis, after complaining that foreigners always divided the lines wrongly in the middle, marked the following pauses in the opening passage of "Athalie":

" Oui, je viens || dans son temple adorer l'Eternel ; ||
Je viens, || selon l'usage antique et solennel, ||
Célébrer avec vous || la fameuse journée
Où sur le mont Sina la foi nous fut donnée. ||
Que les temps sont changés ! || Sitôt que de ce jour
La trompette sacrée annonçait le retour, ||
Du temple, || orné partout de festons magnifiques, ||
Le peuple saint || en foule inondait les portiques." ||

These pauses, however, relate only to the formal rhythm. What gives to Racine's verse its proper beauty is the exquisite inner music of its overtones, composed of the wavering play of the lighter accents

and of the warbling sounds of harmonious syllables, as in the passage beginning :

“ Songe, songe, Céphise, de cette nuit cruelle,”

or in Phèdre’s cry :

“ Ariane ma sœur ! de quel amour blessée
Vous mourûtes aux bords où vous fûtes laissée ! ”

Racine is a man trained to be a director of souls and diverted to the business of the stage. He has the deep sense of sin and the learned insight into the dark and winding recesses of the human heart of a Port Royalist, and these qualities he strangely combines with the extreme passionateness and sensibility of a worldly sort which led to his defection. The result is that no other playwright has so subtle and delicate an instrument for psychological analysis as he has, and, I think, no novelist. For it seems to me that he as much excels Mr. George Meredith and Mr. Henry James in the art of psychology as he does in the art of clear expression. He is the last in date of the five greatest dramatists of the world, and, no doubt, he is the lowest in rank. Still, he is intensely interesting, and intensely interesting in a very modern way. He sees life as we see it, analytically, and he paints it thus incomparably.

There can be little dispute that English verse of the last three-quarters of a century has suffered from the lack of French influence. Our poetic drama has become, in Beddoe’s phrase, a haunted ruin, and our general poetry, in spite of the splendid traditions of our earlier romantic school, has failed either in the matter of ideas or in the matter of form. French verse of the same period, on the other hand, has been fertilised by English influence, and it has developed into the greatest of living literary forces, and produced, in Victor Hugo, as Tennyson and Mr. Swinburne have generously acknowledged, the master singer of the age. And, in my opinion, it has produced also in Verlaine the most poignant and musical of lyrical poets since Goethe and Shelley.

If we wish to recover our ancient position we must study, as Chaucer did, the art of diction among the only people, beside the Greeks, with a fine, sure and native sense of style, and we must study above all the great dramatist in whose plays all the best qualities of the French mind are displayed. A good and a deep effect will, I hope, be produced by Mr. J. C. Bailey’s scholarly and entertaining essays on “ The Claims of French Poetry,” and by Mr. St. John Lucas’s sound and brilliant anthology, “ The Oxford “ Book of French Verse.” Both works happily co-operate at the critical moment to awaken and direct the general taste.

EDWARD WRIGHT.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY, ITALY, AND THE WEST BALKANS.*

THE return visit paid by Signor Tittoni to Baron von Æhrenthal last summer brought the question of Italian and Austro-Hungarian relations once more into prominence; and certain petty encounters between Pan-Germans and Irredentists on the Tyrolese frontier, followed this winter by riots between the German and Italian students of Vienna, have emphasised the necessity for their careful handling. A most interesting commentary on the policy of the two Powers is supplied by a fairly recent book entitled "Österreich-Ungarn und Italien," by Leopold Baron von Chlumecky, who is well-known in Austria as an authority on Dalmatian problems. A closely-reasoned study of the West Balkan and Macedonian questions leads him to the conclusions that Albanian autonomy is unthinkable save under the protection of some European Power, and that "to allow the formation of an autonomous Macedonia under foreign direction, or the creation of a Great Bulgaria or Great Serbia at the gates of the Monarchy, would be to expose the latter to the most dangerous shocks." Apart from this general pronouncement, he says very little about the relations of the Ballplatz to the Bulgarian, Servian or Roumanian Governments, as affected by Macedonia; but, on the other hand, he gives an excellent summary of the mischief wrought by rival bands, and *en passant* breaks many a lance against M. Bérard and other supporters of the Bulgarians, to whom he apportions far the heaviest blame for the present situation in Macedonia. Strangely enough, Greece, which has been so severely lectured of late by the representatives of the Great Powers, is the only Balkan Power which comes in for any measure of praise, and indeed his remarks about Greece and her future in the Balkans read almost like a *ballon d'essai* having an Austro-Hungarian-Greek *entente* as its result. Like all politicians, he regards the prolongation of the Sick Man's life as only a palliative, not a solution, of the problem of the Near East. Unlike most politicians, he is honest enough to avow this belief. Perhaps the most significant passage in the book is that in which he develops this view. "There are lawsuits," he says, "about which one is so nervous

* This article was in proof before the recent declarations of Baron Æhrenthal in the Austrian and Hungarian Delegations.

"that one postpones them as long as possible. But one ought only "to act thus when at the same time making every effort to prevent "the future rival from improving his chances meanwhile, or winning "a position which might crown his claims with success, however "unjustifiable they might be."

This future rival is Italy, which since 1897 has taken the place of Russia as Austria-Hungary's most dangerous competitor in the Balkans. The last century has seen a steady growth of Slav influence at the expense of Italian in the Adriatic provinces of Austria-Hungary, and to-day not even the wildest Irredentist thinks seriously of recovering Dalmatia and Istria, even if he has not abandoned all hopes of Trieste. Perhaps for this very reason Italy has turned her attention in recent years to the more southern shores of the Adriatic, and is making great efforts to achieve the Italianisation of Albania. Numerous schools have been founded there by the Italian Government, especially in Skutari and Valona—not only elementary, but also technical and industrial. The Franciscan and Salesian Orders help to spread the Italian language, and the Italian Consuls actively encourage educational and commercial enterprise. The new dynastic connection with Montenegro has been wisely exploited by Italy, with the result that the tobacco monopoly of the little State has been secured by a Venetian "combine," while other Italian companies have received contracts for the harbour of Antivari and for the railway from that town to Vir-Bazar. Thanks to Government subsidies, the Italian shipping trade with Albania has developed enormously in the last decade, the "Puglia" now running steamers three times a week from Venice, Ancona and Brindisi to Albania, and Italian boats having been started in 1905 on the Lake of Skutari. This shipping activity has naturally been accompanied by a growth of Italian exports to Albania, in the north of which they seem to be superseding Austro-Hungarian, though in Valona and Durazzo the latter hold their own. In 1901 the Austrian-Lloyd accounted for 46 per cent. of the imports into Skutari, the "Puglia" only for 14 per cent.; while in 1905 the proportions had altered to 9 per cent. against 56 per cent. in favour of the Italian line. The Italian Budget Committee has frankly put forward the view that Italy must oust the Austrian-Lloyd and the "Ragusea," unless "the Italian flag is to give up all hope of attaining "the predominance in Albania, whose fate will depend on economic "and moral influences secured by the various Powers."

Meanwhile, the Italian Press keeps the Albanian Question steadily before the public, and Italy is deluged with pamphlets, books and articles upon the subject. "Mare nostro" has become a common Italian way of describing the Adriatic, and indeed the organ of the Italian Navy League bears this surely rather tactless title. The Consulta has never been more scrupulously correct in its dealings with the Ballplatz than it is to-day, and the statesmen at the helm

have loyally defied Irredentist opinion in their adherence to the Triple Alliance. But this has not deterred individual Italian statesmen from encouraging a somewhat dangerous agitation regarding Albania, and to their influence may safely be ascribed the sensational pamphlet which appeared last year under the title of "*Verso la Guerra*," by Signor Pellegrini, a young politician in close touch with the Italian Foreign Office. Unwise as such plain speaking may seem, it is in reality less dangerous than the hypocrisy which lurks in the phrase "*pénétration pacifique*"; and in laying his finger upon this awkward fact in modern diplomacy, Baron Chlumecky has rendered a distinct service to his own country and to Italy. Unfortunately, he falls into the same error himself, when he writes (p. 74): "The peaceful endeavour, entirely freed from territorial aspirations, to secure our political, and above all our commercial supremacy" in Macedonia and Albania is "the sole programme suited to our present conditions." Here and elsewhere in the book the author pleads for the adoption of a more egotistical policy by Austria-Hungary, yet covers his retreat by disclaiming all desire for territorial expansion. But as he at once proceeds to enlarge upon Austria-Hungary's need of an outlet (*Abzugsgebiet*), where her subjects can settle without expatriation, the value of his disclaimer is considerably reduced. Besides, while he speaks in open disapproval of many rival Balkan ideals—Pan-Bulgar, Pan-Serb, Great Albanian, Irredentist alike—he none the less seems disposed to add yet another to the number when he talks of Austria-Hungary's claims to a "mission in the West Balkans." In writing thus, we have no thought of reproaching Baron Chlumecky for the half-uttered daydreams in which he would fain indulge—the more so as they reflect the opinions of more than one distinguished statesman, that Austria-Hungary must either expand or collapse. Anyone who takes such a view must of necessity favour a forward policy in the Balkans, and it is quite possible to justify it on grounds of historic evolution. Indeed, a distinguished Servian publicist holds that Andrassy and other statesmen responsible for the occupation of Bosnia foresaw that this involved further expansion; and certainly one section of the Treaty of Berlin confers upon Austria-Hungary the right to extend her influence "*au delà de Mitrovitza*," while another assures to her a veto upon the construction of new railways and the fortification of certain harbours. Besides, the fact that Austria-Hungary, not content with occupying Bosnia-Herzegovina, maintains a garrison in the Sandjak of Novibazar (which forms a wedge between Serbia and Montenegro, and thus holds open the approach from Vienna and Agram to Salonica), seems to suggest that her statesmen have not renounced all idea of a port on the *Ægean*. An Austro-Hungarian Protectorate in Macedonia grows less fanciful when we come to examine the alternatives. (1) A partition among the Balkan States is well-nigh impossible, because not a single vilayet (except,

perhaps, on the frontier of Epirus) has a sufficiently pronounced national character to be assigned to *one* of the rivals, and because the only result would be a murderous struggle for the booty. (2) Nor can the cry of "Macedonia for the Macedonians" be described as much better than a catchword, since the "races of Macedonia only "know what separates, not what unites" (in Baron Chlumecky's view, the phrase is merely "a wretched fig-leaf to hide the repulsive nakedness of Pan-Bulgarism"). (3) A joint administration by the Great Powers could at best only be provisional, and the joint action of Russia and Austria-Hungary has been possibly an improvement, but certainly not a remedy. Austria-Hungary, as the only Great Power which administers two provinces of the Ottoman Empire, has a special interest in the fate of Macedonia, and above all of Salonica, to which so much of her trade is bound to converge so soon as the railway from Serajevo to Usküb is completed. The last twenty-five years have proved that the Dual State is peculiarly fitted to manage Balkan peoples; for the transformation wrought in Bosnia and Herzegovina, though naturally distasteful to Belgrad and Cetinje, has no modern parallel save in the Egypt of Lord Cromer.

What, then, are the obstacles to a partition, in which Austria-Hungary should be allowed to extend her Protectorate to Macedonia, while Italy became responsible for Albania, and Russia was appeased by her long-coveted access to the Mediterranean? The latter development, to prevent which our own country was ready to plunge into war in 1878, would certainly not meet with the same hostility among the British public to-day; and Germany, the only other Power whose opposition could thwart the scheme, would be won over by concessions in Asia Minor. As Baron Chlumecky justly observes, "a clever policy of compensation" might easily reconcile Austria-Hungary to the presence of Russia on the Dardanelles, and a skilful advocacy of Italian claims on Tripoli might induce Italy to draw in her horns in the Balkans. But we are unable to follow Baron Chlumecky when he goes on to argue that Austria-Hungary could sooner tolerate even a Russian Constantinople than an Italian Valona or Salonica. That both these ports should fall into the hands of a single Great Power is quite unthinkable; and surely an Italian Valona and a Russian Constantinople would be the price which it would be necessary to pay for an Austro-Hungarian Salonica. The occupation of Albania by Italy would be a grave menace to the Dual Monarchy under present circumstances, and would force her into the same aggressive policy as that adopted by Venice in former centuries. But if Austria-Hungary once secured an outlet to the *Ægean*, this menace would disappear, and Italy would find it once and for all impossible to cork up the Adriatic bottle. Thus only two alternatives are possible: either Austria-Hungary and Italy must share Macedonia and Albania between them, or they must devise some means for

placing the Tittoni-Ehrenthal Agreement (the so-called "protocol de désintéressement") on a firm and lasting basis. Certainly neither Power is strong enough to act on the principle of "*Ote-toi que je m'y mette*," and Adriatic politics contain so much inflammable material that the two Governments are bound to approach so delicate a question with the very greatest reserve.

Meanwhile the West Balkan rivalry of Italy and Austria-Hungary is complicated by the South Slav Question, which has been rashly reopened this summer by the attitude of the Hungarian Coalition towards Croatia. The whole eastern coast of the Adriatic is still in a fluid condition. The anomalous position of Dalmatia (as *de jure* part of Hungary, *de facto* part of Austria), the claims and counter-claims upon Bosnia, the rival Pan-Serb and Pan-Croat ideals, coupled with the competition of Belgrad and Cetinje for control over the former—all this and more tends to show that this part of Europe may still be thrown into the melting-pot. For Austria-Hungary the main problem is, whether the union of the South Slavs is to be achieved with her aid or despite her opposition; and this may conceivably be decided by the events of the next few years. The Dual Monarchy, once this question had been solved, would not only take a new lease of life at home, but would soon be irresistible in the Balkans; and hence it may fairly be argued that Croatia and Dalmatia afford the clue which will help us to unravel Austro-Hungarian policy in the Near East.

SCOTUS VIATOR

THE PROSPECTS OF LIBERALISM.

FROM the rejection of the Home Rule Bill in 1886 to the Peace of Vereeniging in 1902 English politics passed through a period of reaction. It is true that the long stretch of sixteen years was broken by three years in which a Liberal Administration held office without power. But the movement of politics is not to be estimated by the ebb and flow of party success alone. It may often be that a party comes into office only to demonstrate its impotence in the face of social forces more powerful than itself; and though General Elections are one index of opinion, they are not by themselves a sufficient guide to the real movements of the social tide. The period of which I speak witnessed an ebb of Liberal ideas not in this country alone, but throughout the world. It was a time in which the older conceptions of civil, political and religious liberty lost their vital force; when the middle class, frightened by the first murmurings of Socialism from the cause of progress, and satisfied with the rights which they themselves had won, transferred their influence to the side of established order when the dominant social philosophy of the day confronted the plea for justice and equality with the doctrine that progress depends on the survival of the stronger in the struggle for existence. The idealism which is essential to modern nations was diverted from the cause of social reform to that of imperial expansion. The white man was bidden to take up, as a duty, the task which most appealed to his vanity, of reducing the millions of the "coloured races" to subjection. Abroad the success of Bismarck had appeared to justify a cynical conception of international duties, and the military, commercial and political success of a great empire imposed the German ideal on the minds of political thinkers. Across the Atlantic the United States threw off its old traditions like a worn-out garment, embraced the imperial mission, and beginning a war with an

appeal to the sentiment of humanity, ended it, after the manner of the old world, with the acquisition of territory beyond the seas.

On all sides brute force claimed the justification of success. The Christian Powers, armed with overwhelming strength, looked on in helpless impotence at the butchery of their co-religionists in the Turkish Empire. The Congo State was fairly launched on its career of rapine, and through Matabele wars and Bechuana revolts South Africa was ripening for its final tragedy. The very victories won by freedom and nationality in the previous generation seemed to turn to dust and nothingness. The French Republic lay in the grip of the clericals and the soldiers. Italy paid the penalty of ambition and aggrandisement, and the outcome of the enthusiasm of Mazzini and the labours of Garibaldi seemed to be a people ground down in poverty beneath the load of a disgraced and disastrous militarism. It needed only the farce of the Greek war to add the touch of ridicule to the discomfiture of the old Liberal traditions. What wonder if the faith of many waxed cold, and if the new enthusiasm for Empire and order, the machine and the master-mind to work it, found the temples empty, swept and garnished, and entered undisputed into possession.

To assign dates for the beginning and end of such a movement of reaction is convenient for purposes of reference, but, of course, has no further validity. To seek the beginnings of the ebb of Liberalism we should have to ascend far beyond 1886. Nor can we say distinctly that the tide began to flow again in 1902. British Imperialism, however, received its first check in the South African War, when the course of events opened the eyes of thoughtful people to the inner meaning of the new gospel, and caused them to ask themselves whither it was leading them. The elements of re-action involved in the imperial idea came more clearly into view. The excitement of the war subsided; and when, in the following year, Mr. Chamberlain launched his scheme of Tariff Reform the ground was ready laid for a vigorous resistance. The Protectionist movement came just too late. In itself a perfectly logical and natural consequence of the general revolt against the Liberal idea, it encountered that idea at a moment when it was gathering fresh strength, and instead of sweeping it out of existence only braced it to new life. The more vigorous the attack on the Free Trade system, the more it revealed its solid foundation in economic principles and in the hard facts of British industry. The Board of Trade figures in their courses fought against Mr. Chamberlain, and the movements of industry seemed as though guided by the Manes of Cobden with the express object of defeating the predictions of his critics. People had to admit that at least in industry freedom had done more than they had imagined. They had forgotten its benefits, and it was only when Mr. Chamberlain compelled them to re-open their histories that they

recalled them. On the other hand, they saw unsuspected dangers in the Imperial union; they began to re-consider the relation of the Mother Country and the Colonies, to ask themselves whether the ties of obligation were all on one side, and to criticise the uses to which appeals to Colonial sentiment were being put. It was recognised that after all industrial and political freedom go together, that the first need in a world-wide empire is that each part should be free to shape its own course, and that if this right was claimed for the dependencies it was paradoxical to deny it to the Motherland. On another side of the field of controversy the vast forces of organised wealth loomed behind the Protectionist attack, and many of those most opposed to Socialistic control awoke to a new sense of the dangers to industrial freedom inherent in the economic structure of modern society. Meanwhile, quite apart from the Free Trade controversy, many causes assisted the Liberal revival. The course of events in South Africa tended to justify the hostile analysis of Imperialism made by those who had been contemptuously dismissed as "pro-Boers." It was recognised that the country could be saved only by the people whom we had spent three years in crushing, that bureaucracy had failed, and that once again there was no salvation but in self-government. At home Nonconformists found that "religious freedom" was no longer a watchword without a meaning, and last, but certainly not least, the world of Labour awoke to the fact that the whole position of trade unionism had been undermined by a series of such decisions as the judicial mind only reaches in periods of general re-action.

The revival was not confined to Great Britain. In the modern world the deeper movements of social opinion can no longer be isolated; but progress and re-action, by their success and failure, propagate waves of encouragement or disillusionment from nation to nation and from continent to continent. The United States has seen to the bottom of its Imperialism, and has learnt to measure if not to grapple with the menace of organised wealth to free institutions. The French Republic has emerged triumphantly from the ordeal of the Dreyfus case, and set its face steadfastly in the path of humanitarian progress. The long night of Russian absolutism itself yielded in 1905 to the first glimmering of a troubled dawn, and Austria, once the centre of European Conservatism, has held her first elections under universal suffrage. In the Far East arose a stranger sign of a new era. The revelation of the power of Japan re-acted on Western Europe first by removing from the sphere of aggressive enterprise the vast and seemingly derelict bulk of the Chinese Empire, and, secondly, by unexpectedly proving that the special characteristics of European civilisation are not the privileges of race or colour. Of the full meaning and depth of the impetus given by Japanese example to the people of Asia it is premature to form an

opinion. Those who consider the great historic vicissitudes in the relation of the two continents, the alternate domination of one by the thought or by the arms of the other, the slow revivals and gradual but sweeping reversals of position, will be most inclined to see in the new movement in China, India and Persia the possibility of a gradual but vital change. Those who deny reality to the new phases of Asiatic thought may chasten themselves by reflecting how short is the time since the Japanese adoption of European methods was ascribed to a shallow imitativeness that might be regarded with a tolerant smile. Few thought that the enquiring and intelligent observers who came to Europe to study German discipline and English ships would, in less than a generation, oust Chinese and Russians in succession from Port Arthur, hurl back the tide of Western immigration to the Amur, and shake with the reverberation of their victories the throne of the Tsars.

These things, however, belong to the region of speculation. Our concern for the moment is with the fact of a general revival of Liberal and humanitarian sentiment affecting in its degree the whole civilised world. Whether this is a permanent movement or only an eddy in the backward tide, whether we shall date a new epoch from the early years of this century, and be able to say that the work of the early Victorian era was resumed in the Edwardian, or whether our children will note merely that the reactionary tendency in which the nineteenth century closed suffered a momentary interruption, are questions which the future alone can decide. At best we may examine the position in our own country and consider how the opposing forces stand.

In 1906 the electorate passed a decisive vote of condemnation on Mr. Balfour's Government. It decisively rejected Tariff Reform. But it did not as decisively endorse any alternative policy. It confirmed in power a Government composed of very heterogeneous elements, relying on a majority which was great but even more heterogeneous. The outstanding controversies of twenty years called for solution. With most of the questions raised Liberals were pledged to deal, and on some they found themselves compelled for the time being to administer a law which they had fought in the making, and which they were bound to do their utmost to repeal. But the actual degree of public interest in these questions is very difficult to measure. For each some solution is energetically demanded by some important group, but when a Bill is brought in to give effect to this demand, the amount of public backing that it receives is a very uncertain quantity. In part the lack of public support for democratic measures is a consequence of the change which has converted the Press, with a few exceptions, from an organ of public opinion into a mechanism for advancing the interests of a few great firms. But in part it is a symptom of the distraction of democratic forces which results from

the absence of clear and comprehensive principles of reform. The old English party system is undermined. Though not yet replaced by the group system of organisation familiar to the Continent, it is honeycombed by what may be called group opinions. The members of a large set of groups call themselves collectively Liberals, and acquiesce with greater or less heartiness in the orthodox Liberal creed. But in reality each is far more intent on its sectional ends than on general measures for the realisation of distinct democratic ideas. People are Temperance Reformers, Woman Suffragists, Land Taxers, Big Navy Men, Economists, and so forth before they are Liberals. Their effective work is given to advancing the interests of their group; and there is more joy over a resolution which is held to pledge the party to some pet point, which, after all, may never see the inside of the Statute Book, than over the successful passage into law of a measure commanding the assent of the party as a whole. There is no cohesion in the Liberal crew, no whole-hearted general backing for the measures which the enthusiasm of a group imposes on a somewhat reluctant party.

It is true that along one particular line of divergences the cleavage is represented by a distinct organization. It may be urged that in the Labour Party at least we have a social ideal, which we may like or dislike, but which we must admit to be coherent, comprehensive and logical. But in reality the position of the Labour Party is one of the paradoxes of politics. To begin with, the cleavage which it makes does not correspond with the real fissure of opinion. There is no division in principle or method between its main body and the advanced Liberals. The ideas of Socialism, when translated into practical terms, coincide with the ideas to which Liberals are led when they seek to apply their principles of Liberty, Equality and the Common Good to the industrial life of our time. Within the Labour Party there is a real division between the doctrinaire Socialism, which is concerned primarily with the academic assertion of ideals, and the practical collectivism of the Trade Union leaders. Within the Liberal Party there is a real and deep division between the men who are for developing and expanding the Radical tradition and those who regard Liberalism as the more enlightened method of maintaining the existing social order. But these lines of cleavage, which appear in every measure of legislation and every act of policy, cut across the division of the two parties. The party tie holds together men who are in essentials opposed, and divides those who in spirit are agreed.

The effect of this group organisation is seen in the fate of Liberal legislation. A measure is introduced in fulfilment of pledges to one section. The rest languidly acquiesce, and it passes its stages in the House of Commons. The Lords, having had time to watch and form their conclusions, consider that there is no adequate force in public

opinion to drive it through against constitutional resistance, and they throw it out. The Government and their followers are indignant. They use language, but they decline to take the Lords at their word and appeal to the country either by referendum or dissolution. At each successive experiment the Peers are naturally emboldened. The game is in their hands. They have only to accept the really popular measures, and they will act as a kind of sieve, letting through the current which might endanger them, and banking up all the least popular Bills as a sort of residuum on which, in the end, the Liberal Party will have to take its stand in calling on the country for a judgment between the Houses.

What, indeed, is the prospect in the present session? The Scottish Bills are to be renewed, but no one suggests that they will be forced through. They are admirable measures, and they have Scotland behind them. But Scotland is not the predominant partner. The Lords are safe unless England is alienated. What, then, of England? There is to be an Education Bill—necessary, no doubt, and in the main just—but it will concentrate against the Liberal Party the whole force of the Church and probably of the Catholics. That is to say, it loses Lancashire. But it is to rally the Nonconformists? Quite so, and they are, at the same time, to be cooled by the Irish University Bill, which is equally just and equally necessary. At the same time the whole force of the "Trade" will be directed against the Licensing Bill, in which, at best, the average man acquiesces without enthusiasm. It is clear that with all these measures the House of Lords will be able to deal precisely as it thinks fit, or, rather, as Mr. Balfour thinks fit; and if he chooses to reduce the whole legislative work of the session to a nullity, there will be none to say him nay.

I am not suggesting that any of these measures could be abandoned. I point out only that the Liberals are confronted with a permanent obstacle which they declined to deal with when their fortunes were at the flood, and which they will now have to meet upon the ebb. The constitutional issue is no easy one to unravel, and the degree of statesmanship expected from a Government is not high. But that the Government should have gone through their first session with no plan at all for securing the passage of their Bills, that after the annulment of their work they should have parted for the recess without deciding on a plan, that they should then have used the strongest denunciations and committed the House of Commons to a resolution to which no effect has been given, and should finally settle down again to the process of passing Bills as though no higher power existed to thwart them, is a course which must surprise even those who took the least favourable view of their capacity. If at every point their object had been to demonstrate the incapacity of the House of Commons, to justify the claims of the Peers, and to cover themselves with the ridicule that attaches to strong speech followed by weak

action, they would indeed have shown remarkable skill in the adaptation of means to ends. But, of course, they acted not on any concerted plan, but as the forces of contending influences impelled them this way and that. The intelligence of their humblest individual member is not to be gauged by the action of the whole. Their behaviour is but one of the manifestations of cross purposes and distracted aims on the democratic side.

If we look across the floor of the House we see the divisions which contributed to the disaster of 1906 rapidly giving way to agreement. Tariff Reform has proved its vitality by surviving the General Election and the disappearance of Mr. Chamberlain from the fighting line. It has conquered Mr. Balfour's evasive ingenuity, and has with it the future of the Conservative Party. What is more serious is that the recent bye-elections have shown that it can no longer be regarded as a hopeless cause in the country districts. Indeed, if it can overcome the workmen's fear of the taxation of food, it clearly has many plausible advantages to offer. To the middle classes, oppressed by the weight of taxation, it offers an alleviation of burdens by making the foreigner find the money for the armaments which are to overawe him. To the employer it appears as a means of destroying competition, and to the workman above all as a method of coping with unemployment. In every case it may be shown, and has been shown over and over again, that its promises are mutually incompatible and its remedies spurious. But when one party offers no remedy at all, people will give a trial to another which at least holds out hope. When the doctor admits that his science is baffled, the patient resorts to the advertising quack.

The great ever-present problem of the modern state is the contrast of overwhelming wealth and grinding poverty. It is true that poverty is less to-day than it was fifty years ago, but wealth is more, and its organised power grows greater from year to year. Wages slowly rise, but even the skilled workman has but a slender margin for saving, and has no adequate means of providing for sickness or old age, and no security against the calamities incident to the fluctuations of trade. Further, the conditions of life make it difficult for the poorer sections of the middle class to maintain a reasonable standard of comfort on their scanty and unprogressive incomes. The rise of rents confines them to small houses in crowded streets, and the monopoly of the roads by the rich men's motor-cars has in large measure restricted their means of cheap and healthful access to the country. It is not surprising that they bitterly resent the contributions levied on them in behalf of those one degree below them in the social scale.

For the inequalities and disorders of the economic system the Socialists offer a remedy. But this remedy, to be complete, involves an absolute revolution in the industrial and commercial system. The moment that it is considered in serious relation with

the facts it breaks up into a number of partial proposals, in which the Socialist ideal becomes an end to be very gradually realised by a long series of reforms. But once again: as soon as any single reform is attacked, it is seen to raise complicated issues which are not satisfactorily solved when they are considered alone, and which threaten the interests of the very classes to which Socialism is appealing for support. The large investments of Friendly Societies, for example, make great classes of working men participants in the order which the Socialist seeks to overthrow, and enlist them in opposition to any measure for the special taxation of rent or interest. Nevertheless Socialism has its ideal, and as an ideal it appeals. Tariff Reform also has its remedy, and as a remedy it appeals. What remedy has Liberalism?

As the party in power, its task is more difficult. It has not only to talk, but to convert speech into action. It has not only to put forward ideas, but to express them in watertight Bills. Of such Bills it has introduced a number, and carried some that are admittedly useful. But without depreciating the value of secondary work, we must admit that with the partial and still doubtful exception of the Small Holdings Act, it has not yet carried into law any organic measure going to the root of poverty, still less any measure to strike the imagination of the people, and compel them to recognise in the Liberal Party the instrument they need for coping with the problems of the time.

This session, however, the Government propose to attack the problem of poverty on one side by a measure of Old Age Pensions. This is a beginning, but whether it is to be such a beginning as to convince a sceptical world that the future of social progress depends on Liberalism is as yet undecided. The Ministers have escaped the pitfalls of the "contributory" schemes, and probably the only important restriction retained will be an income limit, which, however objectionable in itself, may be admitted to be necessary in the initial stages. What is more serious is the question of the amount of funds to be provided and the means of realising them. If, as seems to be assumed, Mr. Asquith is prepared to find some eight millions, he will have to put the age limit so high that the urban workman will thank him for nothing.* Indeed, it is precisely on a question of this kind that the root issues of Liberalism come to the surface. If the party is prepared to go boldly forward with the work of canalising the vast surplus wealth of the country in the direction of social amelioration, it will not hesitate to place a surtax on incomes of three thousand a year and more, and to apply the proceeds to the maintenance of the standard of life. If, on the other hand, it allows itself to be

* By adopting the French principle of a high age limit, with a provision for those certified as disabled from work at an earlier age, this objection might be partially met.

frightened by the absurd scares of hare-brained journalists, it will dissipate whatever resources it taps in the bottomless abyss of naval and military expenditure. On the one line it is possible to advance with measures which will ultimately involve the supersession of the existing Poor Law by rational methods of securing the minimum standard of civilised treatment for the child, the aged and the sick. On the other, every penny wrung from the taxpayer will be devoted to fostering international rivalries by an ostentatious and futile display of armaments which could only be made effective for real defence by a personnel beyond the powers of mere money to command.

Hitherto the problem of financing social reform has been complicated by the traditional methods of local taxation. Every increase of the rates is keenly felt by a large class of men who already hold their heads with difficulty above the poverty line. The question of rating reform is intimately associated with that of municipal progress, and it bears directly on such aspects of poverty as overcrowding and sanitation. Here, again, it lies open to the Liberal Party to reconcile the middle class to the task of combating poverty by a change in the basis of local taxation. In the general lowering of prices which the Free Trade system has made possible, there is one item of universal necessity that forms an exception, and this is the one item which remains heavily taxed. Nearly half of what the workman has gained in the last generation in cheaper food and clothing he has lost in increased house rent, and in the rise of rents he suffers in common with the clerk, the tradesman and the professional man. In part this increase is the inevitable result of the growth of the population, but in part it is due to the operation of our rating system as a tax on buildings and improvements of all kinds to the extent of a fourth or a third of their value. The consequences are aggravated by the fact that the burden falls as heavily on the poorest as on the richest occupiers. The only person who gains is the owner of lucrative sites, who is free to hold them back from the market regardless of public needs until they "ripen" to a monopoly value. Taxed as he is, not on the market value of his land, but on the rents actually received for its use for agricultural purposes or for non-use as derelict open space, he is free to accumulate wealth by withholding from the public the commodity which the public most require. The remedy proposed for these evils, and sanctioned by the Minority Report of the Local Taxation Commission, signed by no less an authority than Lord Balfour of Burleigh, is the separate assessment of the value of sites and the value of buildings. The ultimate object of this assessment will be to relieve buildings of taxation and place the burden of local expenditure on the site value of the locality. But it would naturally begin by transferring a portion of the tax alone. The change would be combined with a provision for the payment of one-half of the tax on the site by the owner, and would forbid contracting

out.* The effect would be to relieve the less fortunate inhabitants of the poorer sites, to draw a larger share of the cost of local government from the owners of the land who directly benefit by that government, and to liberate the building industry from the burden of taxation.

The detailed elaboration of such measures does not lie within the scope of this general survey. It may safely be left in the more competent hands of the many able men who have made a special study of the Housing problem and of Local Taxation. My present object is merely to point out that in demanding constructive measures of social reform from the Liberal party we are not asking for impossibilities. On the other hand, if the party declines the attempt or submits indefinitely to the veto of the Upper House, the close of this Parliament sees the end alike of Liberalism and of Free Trade. Pressed by the problems of poverty, and half scared and half allured by the alternate threats and dazzle of militarism, the electors will yield to the Tariff Reformer and his promise of Taxes without Tears. The workman, seeing comrades falling out of employment through the periodical fluctuations of trade, and conscious of the ever-lurking fear of the same fate for himself, will not be put off by the hard negotiations of the Local Government Board. He will ask of the Government what it has done, with its unexampled majority, for the cause of the poor, and he will not be satisfied with a confession of impotence. There are before the country two possible policies and one that is impossible. It is possible to pretend a cure of social evils, by making the poor man pay through import duties for all the benefits that the State can give him. It is possible to secure these benefits in reality by throwing the cost on aggregations of wealth, which are not merely useless but injurious to their owners, and to the social health. It is not possible to recommend the existing order as the last word of statesmanship and of civilisation.

L. T. HOBHOUSE.

* Existing contracts, on the other hand, which place the burden of all rates on the occupier must be observed, unless irredeemable confusion is to result. I think one exception might be made to this. In cases where the new valuation increases the total amount of rates paid, it may be contended that the action of the State has disturbed the conditions of the contract to the disadvantage of the tenant, and to meet this, the amount of the excess might fairly be divided between owner and occupier.

SIR EDWARD GREY ON CAPTURE AT SEA.

ANYONE who differs from Sir Edward Grey is at a serious disadvantage. His position, a manifest wish to be fair to opponents and to arrive at a just conclusion, a convincing tone of moderation, lend to his arguments weight which may not always belong to them. All these persuasive qualities were present in his recent answer to Mr. F. E. Smith's motion in favour of the immunity of private property from capture at sea; a speech which I have been told "has set back the question ten years." And yet, personal spell apart, the argument put forward in that speech cannot seem to those who have studied the question conclusive; not so if it concerned only England and Germany, as is to-day apt to be assumed; still less convincing if it be looked at all round, with an eye to every contingency, and not merely to the supposed peril of the present hour. The speech does not express a final opinion; it leaves the door open for reconsideration. Perhaps on the occasion of the further motion of which Mr. Smith has given notice, another and a wiser decision may be announced.

In the speech is one novelty. It contains expressions perplexing to the student of international law. If some of the words of the Foreign Secretary be taken in their obvious meaning, that law counts for very little in the estimation of practical statesmen. There is a class of persons who, knowing just enough about international law to be aware that it has not the ordinary legal sanctions, are more Machiavellian than Machiavelli, who profess a *Realpolitik* of cynicism and perfidy, and preach the vanity of international engagements:—all compacts for lessening the evils of war are worth noting; they are sure to be broken when they stand in the way of strong national demands or military necessities. Coming from irresponsible journalists, such sayings go for little. Coming from a statesman of exceptional authority, words which seem to give even faint colour to such doctrines are alarming. I refer to sentences such as these:

"British sea commerce, the British mercantile marine, is the great "prize of the world"—the point upon which the advocates of immunity insist—"Would you really be prepared, even if the Hague Conference had come to a decision—firmly as we might be resolved "to observe that decision and firmly as every other Power might be "resolved to keep it—would you really be quite safe, if you so "decreased the British Navy in consequence of such agreement that "in case of war you would not have the means to protect your "mercantile marine?" That seems about as plain an intimation as could be made by a responsible Minister that such compacts are of little use if the temptation to break them is strong.

It is a fault natural and very common on the part of professors of international law to overrate the strength of its ties. They think too much of a righteous, well-sounding *van*. They do not foresee how while keeping the letter diplomatic casuists may evade the spirit of a solemn engagement. It is good that from time to time their optimism should be rebuked, and that they should be brought back to a sense of the reality of things. But the words cited seem to imply much more than a disposition of caution. What is the use of international engagements if a British Minister of the highest character thinks or suspects that they will be broken when the time comes for putting them in operation? Bismarck is reported to have spoken of the Declarations of Paris as "trash." It is to be feared that Sir Edward Grey's words will be taken to mean much the same in courteous language, and that they will often be quoted by those who represent international law as little more than a series of ruses and stratagems practised with impunity by the weak upon the strong.

Four arguments were advanced in favour of the continuance of the practice of capture at sea. The first arose thus: Mr. F. E. Smith and Mr. J. M. Robertson urged that the German mercantile marine is increasing at a rapid rate; that the German Government must in common prudence take measures to protect it; and that we cannot expect them to reduce their fleet while we insist upon the exercise of the right of capture. The facts seem to be these. In 1900 Germany had on the register 3,883 vessels, with a gross tonnage of 2,826,400; in 1905 the number was 4,320; the tonnage 3,725,456. The rapidity of the increase of the German mercantile marine is shown in these later figures, which I quote from the last volume of the "*Statistik des Deutschen Reichs*." The increase of the whole mercantile marine was in 1907, as compared with 1875, in net tonnage, 142 per cent.; as compared with 1880, 1885, 1890, and 1895, 121 per cent, 100 per cent, 97 per cent, and 68 per cent. (*Die Seeschifffahrt*, 1907, I. 2.)

It is not to be wondered at that in view of this increase the German Government increase their fleet; and that German publicists,

including some who are not warlike, contend that naval disarmament and immunity from capture at sea go together. The official answer is that this consideration had not "the remotest effect" on the prospect of reduction of armament. "They (the great Powers) did not indicate "that it was a material point." But is it a material point? Has it been suggested that partial disarmament should be made conditional on this? Have overtures been made on this footing? And who ought to take the initiative? It would be foolish and a proof of ignorance to assume that the *Flottenbewegung* is ascribable solely or even chiefly to this factor. It is the symbol of national ambition. It is incident to the great expansion of German trade at home and abroad. It is an outcome of the Pan-German movement, the counterpart of the Imperialist movement with us. It is that which, under like circumstances, we should have done. It is the triumph of the idea of Friedrich List, who, next to Lassalle and Bismarck, has had most influence in moulding the political creed of his countrymen. It is the response to List's appeal to them to complete the national equipment. "A nation without a fleet is a bird without wings, a fish without fins, a toothless lion, a stag without horns, a knight with a wooden sword, a helot and a thrall of man-kind." That is the explanation of the movement of the hour. But let the *Flottenbewegung* abate, and the enthusiasm which now supports it die out, still most prudent pacific Germans would hold that a large and growing mercantile marine must be protected by a large and increasing fleet. To such persons our position will appear strong, because consistent and intelligible, only when this justification of naval armament is gone.

Second argument: The mercantile marine of Germany, &c., being exposed to capture is "a guarantee for peace." One must consider in what sense or to what degree this is so. In the event of war we cannot reasonably suppose that the whole mercantile marine of Germany would be captured; it would seek shelter at home or in neutral ports. Supposing that 5 to 10 per cent. of tonnage were taken by our cruisers, what substantial injury would this be to Germany? Much of the loss would be covered by insurance; that which was uninsured would be, in a national point of view, a trivial, certainly not a paralysing, loss. It might be only a source of irritation. Let us note also that that which, viewed by England, is a guarantee of peace is, viewed by others, an incitement to make war against us, the possessors of half of the fleets of the world and with ships on every sea. I may repeat what I have said elsewhere as to this point: "The fire-eating anglophobist is "always talking of 'smashing' England by *guerre de course*. . . . "He knows our dependence upon our imports, and he is always insisting upon our vulnerability. Nor is he without facts to justify him. . . . I take the figures of vessels passing through the Suez Canal, all ocean-going steamers, and all presumably valuable. One

"year the percentages of gross tonnage were:—Great Britain, 57.1; Germany, 16.2; France, 7.6. Broadly stated, and subject to certain qualifications, we stand to lose about eight to one in the matter of ships, and four to one in point of tonnage. These facts and others brought to light by the Food Supply Commission, perfectly well known to the Germans, are but a frail security for peace."

Note, too, at this part how the matter presents itself to States with a small navy and a small mercantile marine. "Il est évident qu' une Puissance possédant une marine de guerre, et une marine marchande, qu'il lui sera impossible de protéger avec une efficacité absolue dans tous les Océans, se trouvera plus disposée à nous faire la guerre, si elle sait que par l'adoption de la proposition de Mr. Choate, nous sommes lié les mains et que nous ne pourrons pas exercer de représailles qui pourraient devenir terribles et très coûteuses. C'est donc comme un élément de défense qu'il nous faut conserver le droit à la pratique que la résolution de Mr. Choate cherche à abolir."* There is no mistaking the quarter in which "reprisals" are threatened. They might be serious and costly, if not "terrible," though they lasted only for a short time.

Third argument: There will be war "with limited liability" if private property on sea is exempt from capture. What modern war is not one of that character? In what were the various Commissions at the Hague engaged except in imposing limitations on warfare—in improving the Geneva Convention, in restricting the use of floating mines, in altering the laws of war on land with a view to the greater protection of the property of non-combatants? What are the conditions agreed to at the Hague but so many limitations of barbarous methods?

Fourth argument: The capture of private property is connected with commercial blockade, or, to quote the Instructions to the English representatives, "unless commercial blockade is discontinued there will be constant interference with an enemy's ships, and constant disputes as to what constitutes an effective blockade. And when such disputes have once arisen between belligerent Powers, it is obvious that the one which considers itself aggrieved would cease to respect the immunity of the merchant ships and private property of its enemy where found." The close connection of the two measures is not very obvious—as little obvious, some may think, as the value of commercial blockades in these days of developed railway communication. Belligerents are usually sensitive and often unreasonable. There is, of course, liability to disputes, not merely as to the question of effectiveness, but also respecting questions of notice of blockade, as to which the practice of countries differs much;

* *Courrier de la Conférence*, 6th July, 1907. I take this opportunity of saying how much is due to Mr. W. T. Stead for the reports of the proceedings of the Conference. But for him its history would be unknown, and appreciation of its work impossible.

and angry belligerents may make reprisals for supposed wrongs in any way that is convenient. But surely blockade, affecting neutrals equally with belligerents, stands or falls for reasons not applicable to a purely belligerent right.

These are the chief points in a speech which has made much impression. It is silent about many arguments on the other side. It ignores the fact impressively and with much ability urged by Mr. Smith—that if the Declaration of Paris as to the immunity of enemy's goods in neutral vessels is observed, there must be a strong incentive to carry goods in neutral bottoms, to the temporary, it may be to the permanent, injury to our mercantile marine. There is silence as to a less obvious argument, but one not without some weight—that, such captures, while ineffective in determining the issue of a war, leave behind a sense of injustice which makes peace precarious. Elsewhere I have said, "Most of us have met Frenchmen who, "oblivious of Sedan and resigned to the loss of Alsace, remembered "the story told by their fathers of some rude act of spoliation by the "invaders in their chateau or family home. The five milliards are "forgotten; the rude exactions levied upon villages or communes or "portable clocks—the last generally mythical—removed by the "unwelcome guests are remembered. It is one of the beneficent "effects of the modern principle, according to which wars are waged "between States, that nations which have parted in anger come "together upon peace being signed with no sense of bitterness, with "readiness to forget and forgive, and sometimes with increased "mutual respect. The wound does not heal so quickly, there is a "heritage of grudges and hatred if private individuals, arbitrarily "selected, have been sufferers." A just instinct has made civilised nations say that if there must be war, it should be war in its essence, man struggling against man. The history of the gradual elimination of other forms of offence less direct is the history of the evolution of warfare. A perception of this truth, more even than the sense of humanity, has, I suspect, led to the abandonment on land of war with unlimited liability—to respecting private property on land, except when required for military purposes—and will, I hope, one day lead to like results at sea.

The Hague Conference has been disappointing as to many things, and particularly in the failure to agree respecting this point. The contrast between the promises or high-pitched expectations at the opening and the achievements at the end proved great. There have been disillusion. The imperfection of the machinery of the Conference has been revealed; and it has been shown that unanimity as to some matters of moment to the *civitas gentium* is at present, and probably for years to come, out of the question. I do not exaggerate the practical value of the abstract resolutions adopted; some of them

bind those who enunciated them to little when passions are aroused. But there is an opposite error, and one which has been much too common, that of ignoring the good and durable work of the Conference. In three or four months, which seemed barren to those who noted only the colourless and fluent talk, it advanced international law more than had been done by half a century of irresponsible discussion. It has prepared the way for a simplification of the laws and usages of neutrality, and for a time when, to quote Dr. Lawrence, a great quantity of antiquated legal débris will be jettisoned. The points of difference between nations have been narrowed and identified; the position of the various States as to questions likely to give trouble in war has been defined. The Conference has been a useful lesson as to the procedure in similar gatherings,—for example, that which our Government proposes to call. The Conference would be memorable if only because England has, in regard to contraband and other matters, shown for the first time a distinctly conciliatory spirit and a desire to bring her practices into harmony with those of Continental countries. It would have been still more memorable if it had put an end to one of the surviving methods of barbarism in warfare.

JOHN MACDONELL.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

AUSTRIA AND RUSSIA.

International readjustment is the process to which the changes are largely attributable which are being daily chronicled in the political domain—readjustment of old means to new ends, the building up of inter-racial friendships on the ashes of dead hates, the wiping out of old scores, the dovetailing of sets of national interests which until recently crossed and clashed. The process is at once inevitable and painful. Foremost among the events that rendered it necessary may be mentioned the adoption of a world policy by the United States, the advance of Japan to the first rank of great Powers, and the temporary disablement of Russia. Owing to these three changes, the balance of power, not only in Europe, but throughout the globe, has been upset, and nations and States are now more or less rapidly finding their new level, not without shocks and jolts and, at times, even real dangers. Hence the history of the next few years will deal mainly with the successive stages of this transformation, and with the fruitful or barren events and incidents which ushered it in or characterised its progress.

Voltaire once aptly remarked that some occurrences in the life of a political community bring forth important results, while others have none. The one lead to new spheres of national activity; the others resemble "no thoroughfares." What puzzles politicians who witness both kinds of events is how to distinguish those which are fraught with fateful consequences from the others which are devoid of filiation. Time alone can supply the criterion. The Austro-Russian agreement about the Balkans and its sudden end afford a striking illustration. The partnership came to most people as a surprise, because for a whole generation the aims and interests of these two States in the east of Europe had been diametrically opposed to each other; and to endeavour to reconcile

them appeared as hopeless as to try to mix oil and water. That was one reason for the astonishment provoked by their sudden rapprochement. Another was Russia's infidelity to her mission in Europe. The main object on which she had set her heart, and which she had long been pursuing perseveringly, despite formidable obstacles and at the cost of heroic sacrifices, was the welfare of the Slavs of Southern Europe. It was for this aim that the Crimean War and the campaign of 1877 were undertaken, and their disastrous consequences endured. Yet, forgetful of this mission, Russia all at once made a pact with "the secular and wily enemy of all Slavs," and the purpose of that covenant was to keep her younger brothers from bursting their bonds until . . . something turned up. Never had holy Russia fallen so low—her patriots said—as on the day when the unholy convention between Counts Goluchowski and Muravieff was signed. It was the bartering of the nation's birthright for a mess of pottage. In Russia, where the Slavophile aspirations and ideals preached by Khomiakoff, Aksakoff and Solovieff are still felt by some as living forces, the Austro-Russian agreement was abhorred and anathematised as the inexpiable sin. Thinkers and writers declared that it would lower Russia, harm the Slavs generally, and contribute to the success of Austria's policy in the Near East. And now, since Baron von Aehrenthal's memorable speech to the Delegations, they are crying aloud that their predictions have come true. As the subject is likely to crop up frequently in the near future, it may be well to set forth the principal data.

HOW THE AUSTRO-RUSSIAN AGREEMENT CAME ABOUT.

Macedonia, although a country of numerous tribes and tongues, has a population of which the chief ethnic elements are Serbs, Bulgarians, and Greeks. The last-named are numerically the most important, while the Turks are, so to say, intruders. Between Bulgarians and Serbs a bitter struggle has been waged for political predominance, each party being supported more or less effectively by its kindred in the kingdom of Serbia or the Principality of Bulgaria. Both races in Macedonia speak almost the same language, profess the same religion, and intermarry, so that the need of distinguishing between them did not arise until the Bulgarian Church, freeing itself from the Greek Patriarch, established an exarchate. Then all the flock of the Exarchate was deemed to consist of Bulgarians, although in reality many were Serbs; and the vigorous proselytising campaign carried on by agents from the Principality was successful in gathering many thousands more into the true fold.

Bulgaria had luck from the outset. Before this people had been freed from the Mohammedan yoke the Turkish Government favoured

them because it hated the Serbs, who were believed to be trying to gather together all Slavs and to found a powerful Slav State. After the creation of the Bulgarian Principality the Turks continued to wink at the Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia, because of Stambuloff's anti-Russian and Turcophile policy. And in this way crowds of Macedonians were won over to the Bulgarian Exarchate. Moreover the Prince's Government warmly seconded the efforts of its agents. Money was spent liberally and judiciously. Many Macedonians who distinguished themselves at school were sent to finish their education at Sofia, where the most gifted among them received high places in the civil service or the army. In time, however, peaceful agitation gave way to filibustering expeditions, culminated in bloodshed, and drove the Turks to repressive measures against the Bulgarian element in Macedonia. As this element possessed influential friends in Bulgaria who were impatient to deliver their brethren from Mohammedan thralldom, the risk of a Turco-Bulgarian War became real and imminent. Now a campaign of this kind, even if successful, would be worse than useless unless Bulgaria enjoyed the goodwill of the Powers interested in the Balkans, and as this element of success was lacking, Russia and Austria combined in order to stave off the day of reckoning by declaring their resolve to maintain the *status quo* in the Peninsula.

IS AUSTRIA THE ARCH ENEMY OF THE SLAVS?

Such was the genesis of the Austro-Russian agreement.

In Russia this arrangement was most unpopular, even among those liberal politicians who were in favour of peace at a heavy price abroad in order the better to carry on a struggle for thorough reform at home. The reason is that the Slavs of Southern Europe have come to be regarded as members of that larger Russia whose definite outlines are still hidden from our gaze like those of a lofty, mistcapped mountain. Whether the Slavs of Southern Europe are destined to thrive, coalesce, found a powerful political community and play a prominent part in history is problematical. Formidable enemies, domestic and foreign, have first to be vanquished. And the most formidable of the latter class is believed to be Austria, backed, as she has been, by Germany since the Berlin Congress.

The Berlin Congress, hated by all Russians, was looked upon as an international tribunal convoked by Austria for the purpose of trying and condemning the Slav cause. They still call to mind with bitterness Andrassy's memorable speech there one warm June day, in the course of which he laid it down that Austria-Hungary cannot brook the creation of any new States in the Balkans, nor allow Serbia and Montenegro to strengthen themselves at the expense of Bosnia and Herzegovina, neither permit any Slav States to take root in the

Peninsula. He added that Austria-Hungary aims at penetrating by means of railways and trade to the *Ægean* Sea. Now that policy, Russian writers argue, having never been formally abandoned, the Tsar's Foreign Secretary ought never to have consented to work hand in hand with the "arch enemy of the Slavs" in the Balkans. Tracing that policy further, they dwell with indignation on the meshes woven in Vienna to catch Serbia, but which captured only King Milan, who was egged on to declare war against Bulgaria. They fume and fret when recounting the successful expedients, mostly of an economic character, by which Austria kept Serbia and Bulgaria from striking up a league of mutual friendship. And, stigmatising as disloyal the separate action of Austria, who has been asking the Sultan for railway concessions in private at a time when she was supposed to be sternly urging upon him in public the need of reform in Macedonia, Russians hold that the spirit, if not the letter, of the agreement has been violated, and they now call upon their Minister of Foreign Affairs to let the dead bury their dead, and to return to the traditional policy which the Tsardom ought never to have abandoned.

AUSTRIA'S RAILWAY POLICY IN THE BALKANS.

Baron Aehrenthal's speech on foreign affairs, addressed to the Hungarian Delegation on 27th February, was received by the Russian Press as a frank avowal that the Austro-Russian agreement had broken down, and would now be succeeded by a line of action more in accordance with the commercial and political interests of Austria-Hungary. This admission they deprecated as sudden and vexatious. But it is not of this change that Russians complain most. For them the sting of the grievance lies in the fact that before this open confession was made or hinted at, Austria-Hungary had entered into negotiations with the Porte for the purpose of obtaining railway concessions, without informing her ally of this new departure. The first inkling which the general public got of the matter was that publicly given by Baron von Aehrenthal himself. The Austrian Foreign Secretary told his hearers that the Government of Kaiser Franz Joseph was minded henceforward to strike out a solid railway policy, and would begin by building a junction at Urvatz in the Sandjak of Mitrovitsa, whereby Turkey in Asia would be connected with Bosnia, and then construct a further coast line by which Cattaro would be linked with Montenegro. Another scheme which the Minister also mentioned with complacency was the connecting of Athens with Vienna by linking the Greek with the Turkish lines at Larissa, and thus obtaining the shortest railway route to Egypt.

So simple, natural and harmless did these proposals appear to the Minister's hearers that at first little or no stress was laid upon them by the Press of other countries. It was only when the Russian

Press furnished its comments to the speech that the position grew clear. The chief count in the indictment against Austria-Hungary is the concealment which she practised towards her partner, the inevitable effect of her two-sided action, by which the Porte was encouraged to refuse the reform demanded for Macedonia, and, lastly, the direct tendency of the new policy to split up Servia into two halves, and to give Austria and Germany a right of interfering whenever a rising or even a local riot takes place in any part of the Balkans.

From a purely formal point of view Austria was well within her rights in asking for the concession. For although section 25 of the Treaty of Berlin empowered her to occupy Bosnia, she spontaneously waived the right of administering that part of the province which, situated between Servia and Montenegro as far as Mitrovitsa, was known as the Sandjak of Novibazar. At the same time, however, she reserved the right of maintaining garrisons in the Sandjak, and having military and commercial routes there. Although more than twenty-eight years have passed since then, Austria-Hungary has never once exercised her right of pushing further into the Sandjak of Novibazar by means of railroads or otherwise. And to this significant fact, it is now affirmed, great weight was attached by Russian diplomatists when the question arose of coming to an arrangement with the Austrian Government. If Austria had abstained so long from separate action in the Balkans, and at a time when she had signed no self-denying ordinance, it might fairly be assumed that if she made a promise harmonising with that abstention she would certainly keep it. The arrangement was accordingly come to and religiously observed—but only by Russia. Austria violated it. That is one of the chief counts in the indictment against Baron von Aehrenthal.

Great stress is laid by Russians on the fact that their Government loyally stood by a compact which was hateful to the whole nation. This, they add, is all the more praiseworthy that they too had a railway project ready for approval; but they kept it away in one of the pigeon holes of their Foreign Office. It is a scheme for the construction of a transversal line which would link Odessa and Varna, via Nish (in Servia) and Mitrovitsa, with the Montenegrin coast of the Adriatic. It is only fair to admit that this too would be a political expedient, as well as a commercial venture. It would unite both Servian States, and would afford an outlet on the Adriatic to all Slav nations.

AUSTRIA'S RAILWAY SCHEME WILL KEEP THE SLAVS SEPARATED AND POWERLESS.

Austria's Balkan policy, as reflected in Russian minds, may be summarily defined as an application of the maxim *divide et impera*.

Men of Servian and Bulgarian race must be kept from uniting, and Austria must enjoy a permanent right of intervening in all disputes among Southern Slavs. Were this precaution neglected, a Serbo-Bulgarian League might well prove a match, or even more than a match, for Turkey, and baulk the policy of "no new States in the Balkans." These considerations moved Austria in 1903 to come to a secret agreement with Greece,* whose claim to a share of the spoil in Macedonia has been acknowledged therein. Actuated by the same motives, her diplomatists ingeniously sowed discord between Montenegro and Serbia, and took under their protection the Prince of Montenegro, "the only friend of Russia" in the days of Alexander. But as none of these measures offers a solid guarantee that a Slav coalition is once for all eliminated from the list of likely contingencies, the railway scheme was taken up to supplement them. Its principal advantage to Austria is the right it will confer upon her to play the part of guardian to the Balkan Slavs.

It is asserted by Russian critics that the railways in view have little strategical or political value for the Hapsburg monarchy. Whether troops travel by rail or march does not make much difference, it is agreed, so long as the distance is only 60 or 70 miles. Again, Austria has no intention of exporting produce from Bosnia via Salonika or any other port on the Ægean Sea. It is her interest to ship her wares at an Adriatic seaport. Neither is it to her advantage to allow Servian and Macedonian goods to compete with her own in the Bosnian markets. To those who imagine that the projected railway may confer advantages worth having, as a transit route, the reply is given that the Bosnian lines are narrow gauged.† Consequently the sole respect in which the new route can prove helpful is that of allowing Austria openly to intervene among the Balkan Slavs—to play a role analogous to that which Prussia plays in Germany. With the realisation of this design, Russia's protectorate of Southern Slavs may, perhaps, become a dream. Therefore, if she has not irrevocably given up her cherished mission of holding out a helping hand to her kith and kin who are scattered over South-Eastern Europe, now is the moment to proclaim her resolve, now is the time to take effectual means of carrying it out. The die is being cast.

RUSSIAN PUBLIC OPINION.

That is the Russian point of view, which those who seek for helpful indications of the coming changes in the relations of the great Powers would do well to grasp, together with its peaceful corollaries. Nobody doubts that the abandonment to Austria of the

* It is only fair to say that the Austrian Press denied this allegation at the time Baron Aehrenthal's statement, however, that Greece would be linked up with Turkey at Larissa is likely to be taken as confirming the statement.

† Q. 75 metre.

role of Protector of the Slav peoples would deal a deadly blow to Russia's prestige. It would be as though the lode star of her national life had gone out. Neither is there any difference of opinion that this is what will happen if the railway scheme be carried out without let or hindrance. Moreover, several politicians whose opinion carries weight hold that it is Russia's intention, not less than her interest, to run many grave risks rather than meekly resign herself to what is neither a decree of Fate nor an accomplished fact. Many of her political writers were moved to passion by the perusal of Baron von Aehrenthal's speech. The nation, they hold, in their calmer mood, must now act upon its own warrant in the face of sharp criticism, and even strong opposition. Russia is confronted with the question "To be or not to be"; and her answer must take the form of daring effort or of ignoble resignation. As public opinion on this subject will undoubtedly determine her policy, the student of contemporary history cannot ignore its trend. And the prevalent, nay, the unanimous view is that Austria's action was inspired by Germany. "Austria's anti-Slav machinations in the 'Balkans,' writes the *Novoye Vremya*, "are inspired and supported by Berlin. Germany is perseveringly labouring to construct the Bagdad Railway, which will deliver all Asia Minor into her hands. In order to connect German lines with the Ægean Sea, she is co-operating with the plans of Austria, who is linking up her rail routes with those of Turkey and Greece. . . . The assistance which Turkey is giving to her in carrying out these schemes Germany pays by upholding Turkey against the demands of the other Powers in the question of Macedonian reforms and in Persian affairs. . . . Germany's plans are characterised by breadth and are calculated for a long space of time. Their realisation would invest Germany with such power that her word would become law."* Nor is this way of looking at the matter confined to any one Press organ or political party. The moderate *Slavo*, in an article entitled "Unanimity in the Russian Press," writes:—"We cannot but note, as a remarkable phenomenon, the unanimous estimate of Austria's Balkan policy by our entire Press. Journals of the most divergent parties, pursuing the most conflicting aims, expressing the most irreconcilable views on domestic questions, are at one in uttering a stern condemnation of Austria's double role. . . . If our Government showed itself indifferent to this it would not be a Russian Government."†

THE FOREIGNER'S POINT OF VIEW.

Foreigners can look upon the diplomatic game with serener feelings, and discern in the projected railway extension a grandiose plan for

* *Novoye Vremya*, 4th February, 1908.

† *Slavo*, 31st January, 1908.

the creation of a new route between East and West. To connect Calais with Calcutta by rail, and to bring the two cities within twelve days of each other, is one of the aims of the Russo-Indian and the Bagdad Railway schemes. But during the long years that must elapse before either of these plans becomes a reality, various experiments are occasionally suggested for shortening the time of the journey. Greece being the most southerly point of Europe, time would be saved by forwarding the mails via that country, instead of Italy, if the Greek railways were not isolated. Baron von Aehrenthal's scheme supplies the missing links, one of which—110 miles long—would join the Bosnian railway stations, Urack and Mitrovitsa, whereby the Austro-Hungarian lines would be connected with Salonika; and two other links in the chain, one binding Salonika with Larissa, in Greece, and the other joining Larissa with Khalkis, would bring Athens and the Piræus into direct communication with the central European network of railways.

Italy, however, regards the undertaking with the eyes of an interested party. One of the items in Baron von Aehrenthal's programme is the construction of a line from Cattaro to the seaboard of Montenegro. Italian capitalists, who have solid economic interests in Montenegro, are calling in question Austria's right to build this line. Moreover, they have their own scheme *in petto*, which provides for a railway from Antivari through Servia, Bulgaria, and Roumania—a line for which official estimates have, to my knowledge, been made by more than one group of serious capitalists.

RUSSIA, GERMANY, AND THE BALTIC.

The little Baltic States, too, although seemingly far removed from the vortex of politics, are affected by the process of readjustment. Norway set the machinery going by dissolving partnership with Sweden, whereby she isolated herself and her ex-partner to a dangerous extent. By this act she ceased to enjoy the guarantee given by Great Britain and France to the Union. Subsequently, apprehensive of the possible consequences of her helplessness, she expressed her desire to have some other arrangement made which would ease her fears by protecting her against the danger of annexation. This request was complied with last November, when Great Britain, Russia, France and Germany signed a new treaty, which guarantees Norway's integrity for ten years, and narrows the scope of her activity in the sphere of politics. Therefore Sweden declined to be dealt with in the same way. Something, however, had to be done, and Germany conceived the idea—who first proposed it is uncertain—of getting the Baltic Powers to make a declaration to keep the *territorial status quo* of each and all inviolate. Respecting the Baltic waters, nothing has been discussed or proposed; consequently the reports touching upon the closing of that sea are groundless.

A question, however, that was mooted was that of Russia's sovereign rights over the Aland Islands. If the position of Scandinavian Powers calls for modification, argued Russian diplomatists—so does that of Russia in a matter connected with those Scandinavian States; “and if we contribute to their safety, it behoves them to do something to uphold our dignity.” Russia holds three hundred granite islands known as the Aland Archipelago, of which eighty are inhabited. Their value is mainly strategical, as they command the entrance to the Gulfs of Bothnia and Finland. After the Crimean War, when the Tsardom had been tried and condemned, so to say, by the European areopagus, every measure of precaution was taken to hinder the government of Alexander II. from indulging in a policy of expansion. And as Sweden and Norway were believed to be especially exposed to the evil effects of this policy, the Treaty of Paris was supplemented by another document curtailing Russia's sovereign rights in that Archipelago. Yielding to the pressure of Great Britain and France, Tsar Alexander set his signature to the document, by which he undertook not to fortify the islands nor to keep any naval or military establishments there.

Not only is this stipulation regarded as humiliating, but it is also felt as an irksome hindrance to the adoption of measures of precaution, sometimes rendered necessary by conditions wholly foreign to international relations. For example, during the recent insurrection arms and ammunition were imported into Russia through Finland, in a steamer chartered for the purpose by the Revolutionists, whereupon the authorities despatched a few troops to the Aland Islands to keep a look-out for other revolutionary vessels. But an outcry was raised against the Imperial Government in the Press, and the statement was circulated that treaty obligations were being unscrupulously violated. This humiliating treaty was borne with until the question of guaranteeing Sweden became urgent, and then Russia, deeming the time come for cancelling it, put forward this view, but at first incidentally only. For it is not with Germany that the matter can be discussed. Russia's obligation is towards France and England, and it is with their consent that the stipulation will be abrogated. If all these schemes are brought to a successful issue, the result will be that the Baltic States will guarantee each other their territorial integrity by means of a Baltic Declaration on lines analogous to those of the Mediterranean Agreement. Russia will resume full sovereign rights over the Aland Archipelago, and there may also be a North Sea Agreement, the nature of which would resemble in essentials that of the Baltic.

THE TSAR AND HIS FINNISH SUBJECTS.

Two resolutions lately penned by the Tsar himself on the subject of Finno-Russian relations deservedly take high rank among the

important events of Russia's domestic history during the past month. For they draw a line of demarcation between Finland's rights and the Tsar's prerogatives about which more is certain to be heard anon. It was when perusing two reports of the State Secretary for Finland on recent acts of the Finnish Diet that the Emperor jotted down the fateful words which already hundreds of thousands of his subjects know by heart, and which, put into plain language, mean little more than this: "If I render unto Finland the things that are Finnish, I am resolved to see that the Finns render unto the Tsar the things that are the Tsar's. And the sooner they realise this fact the better."

Between the Empire and the Grand Duchy a resolute struggle has long been going on, the immediate object of which has differed considerably at various times: at one period it was the restitution of the *status quo* which prevailed when Finland was first taken over by Russia from Sweden; at another it was the attainment of a much more democratic and autonomous constitution, by dint of whittling away the Tsar's prerogatives. The latter is the aim which the leaders of the Finns are at present said to be pursuing. Possessed of the necessities of national life, they crave the luxuries. Finland at present has the institutions of which the Russian General Bobrikoff deprived her. She has a very democratic representation, a single chamber, and woman's suffrage. But Finnish and Swedish politicians are far from being satisfied yet. Politicians—especially patriotic politicians—are insatiable all the world over. The Finnish leaders naturally want all they can get for their native land; and if they could extend its rights until the only band of union between Finland and Russia was their Grand Duke—the Tsar—they would probably rest at least on their political oars. Russia, on the other hand, wants at least all she at present has; which seems very little. For she already has relinquished much that she wanted to retain, and more than Russian Nationalists deem fair and reasonable. The Finns enjoy a large measure of home rule, in some respects much larger than that which the Irish people ever ventured to demand or hope for. Thus they have their own tariffs, their own custom houses, their own two languages—Finnish and Swedish—their own church, their own educational laws, their own penal and civil codes, and their own Parliament or Diet. So favourable to the Finns are the relations between the two countries that a Finnish subject is eligible for any post in Russia, even that of Cabinet Minister—at present the War Minister is a Finn—whereas a Russian is not capable of being appointed to any situation in the Finnish civil service.

There are, however, still some Russian trammels to be shaken off, and the Finns are exerting themselves to the utmost to get rid of them. But they are mostly prerogatives of the Tsar, which he took over from the Kings of Sweden. And now, for the first time since

the November Manifesto,* Nicholas II. has asserted his authority publicly and autocratically—the only way in which it could be asserted, owing to the old-world relations that subsist between himself and his Finnish subjects. “Thus far and no farther” is the meaning of the remarks he has just made to democratic Finland. And what the Tsar has written, the Duma will certainly endorse.

GAME OF CHESS BETWEEN FINN AND RUSS.

It is not very easy to make the subject matter of the dispute quite clear to the British reader. But it is worth attempting. At bottom it is a budgetary question. The Russian Tsars wield to-day the same power to levy taxes in the Grand Duchy and spend the proceeds for the needs of the people as the Swedish kings exercised a century and a half ago. The extent of these rights may be realised when the fact is grasped that the representative Finnish Chamber merely takes cognisance of the budget, but it is not authorised to grant or refuse ordinary supplies. That is a cardinal factor in the relations between the chief of the State and his subjects, and it was so in the days of the Swedish domination. Another circumstance, of technical rather than political import, is that the Finnish budget is dealt with not as a whole, but as a number of separate items called “funds,” such as the “State fund,” the “militia fund,” the “beneficent,” and the “labour-institutions fund,” the “military house fund,” the “communications fund,” the revenue stamp tax and the distillation tax. It is open to the chief of the State to expend these credits without seeking the sanction of the Chamber. And from the year 1809 down to 1863 the Tsars, as Grand Dukes, regularly laid out these sums in virtue of their supreme power without the sanction or assent of any representative body. Later on, Alexander II. was moved to give up a small part of this prerogative and bestow upon the Diet the right of controlling the expenditure of the revenue stamp tax, the distillation tax, and also the communications fund. The disposal of the remaining revenues, however, is still in the sole discretion of the chief of the State.

The Finns, grown democratic, naturally enough resent this, and would like to transfer these prerogatives from the crown to their Diet. But how? As they cannot appeal to historic rights, they use whatever leverage they can find, and resort to various expedients on the most propitious occasions: if not by hook, then by crook. Thus they drafted new parliamentary rules of procedure in 1906 of which one clause, calculated to lay the axe at the root of the grievance, gives the disposal of the whole budget to the Diet. For that very reason, however, the Russian government declined to sanction them. Then the authors of the rules, disavowing all

The Manifesto on the subject of Finland was issued on 4th November, 1905.

intention of sneaking concessions in a surreptitious manner, affirmed, that their only object was to improve the wording of the document. The Russians expressed their joy thereat. That consummation merely confirmed the old order of things, whereby the Diet takes cognisance of the estimates but may neither refuse nor even modify them.

The Finnish Diet, which is now probably the most democratic legislative body in all Europe, tried again by creating an accomplished fact in the following way: The Tsar, congruously with his right, having assigned 16,400,000 marks* for expenses common to the Empire and the Grand Duchy from the militia and State funds, and finding that 3,600,000 marks† more were needed, called upon the Diet to vote this supplementary credit. That was the legal and traditional method of procedure. Now the disposal of all such supplementary credit belongs not to the chief of the State alone, but to him and the Diet conjointly, whereas the expenditure of the "funds" or ordinary credits depends upon his discretion only. The Diet, availing itself of its opportunity, voted not merely the supplementary credit, but also the 16,400,000 marks which had already been assigned by the head of the State, and with which the Diet had nothing at all to do. Here then was a valuable precedent which would, if it had gone unchallenged, have transferred the control of the budget to the Deputies. But the Emperor and the Grand Duke wrote upon the document: "I call the attention of the Diet to the circumstance that the disposal of the State and militia funds is exclusively within my discretion."

The second of the Tsar's resolutions has to do with the division of the estimates into separate funds. Of these funds the Emperor, as Grand Duke, can dispose in virtue of his supreme power; whereas he cannot spend supplementary credits otherwise than by agreement with the Diet. Hence these two kinds of credit are always kept apart. The Diet, however, drew up estimates for 1908 in which, contrary to the rules, it neglected to assign credits for special purposes to their respective "funds," but mixed them all in one, changed certain items, and then sanctioned the estimates *en bloc*. It was on the report which informed Nicholas II. of these acts that he wrote: "In view of the arguments adduced in the loyal reply of the Diet to my proposal respecting advances to be made for military purposes, I call the attention of the Diet to the fact that the disposal of the resources of the State and militia funds depends solely upon my direct approval. And, as I consider the contention of the Diet incomparable with the laws in vigour, I hereby command that twenty million marks be transferred to the resources of the Imperial Exchequer, and that of this sum 16,400,000 marks be

* £650,875.

† £142,875.

"assigned to the State and militia funds, and 3,600,000 marks be
"assigned to the temporary taxes voted by the Diet."

THE RUSSIAN DUMA AND THE FINNISH DIET.

There are two sides to every question, however simple and clear it may seem. And eloquent pleaders might convince many that there was a good deal to be said in favour of the Russian as well as the Finnish point of view. Anyhow, the Duma is about to take the matter up, and a parliamentary committee is already marshalling the data that bear upon it. From the utterances of the leaders of parties we may hazard a guess at the results. The Extreme Right is quite convinced that the relations between Finland and the Empire are abnormal. M. Purishkewich, the chief of the party, is indignant that the Finns should be so perseveringly undermining the power of the chief of the State. He maintains that they regard Russia as their enemy and treat her accordingly. "Finland will and must become Russian. Not that we shall seek to deprive the Finns of their native language or introduce Russian schools there. No, but we shall oblige them to think like Russians, like members of the Russian State. They shall have exactly the same rights and duties as Russians. . . . But Finland must cease to be a State within the State. . . ."

The leader of the Moderate Right, M. Krupensky, states that he fully recognises the culture of the Finns, and respects their right of governing themselves so far as this right does not clash with the general interests of the Russian State. "I want the Finns," he says, "to cease to regard Russia as a wholly foreign country to which they are not bound to render any account. They may continue to enjoy the rights that have already been conferred upon them, but these rights must not be turned against Russia. . . . Where on all the globe is it seen that the subjects of one and the same State do not enjoy equal rights on a given territory? Finland belongs to the Russian State, and it is only meet that on Finnish soil Russian citizens should not be denied the right of settling. . . . If the Finns spurn good advice and will not listen to reason, the Government will have no choice but to despatch soldiers to the Grand Duchy."

The Octobrist, M. Polofftseff, holds similar views. "The present relations of Finland to Russia are irreconcilable with our own interests. At the helm there are individuals who are anything but well disposed towards us. The vast majority of the Diet is made up of Radicals and Socialists. Finland is become the refuge of Russian revolutionists and terrorists who go on weaving their plots from there. Lately an agent was sent to the Grand Duchy in order to arrest a very enterprising revolutionist. The place of residence of the delinquent was known. The agent appealed to

" the Finnish authorities, who hastened to inform the revolutionist
" that he would be seized within an hour. Now we cannot endure that
" within some twenty miles of St. Petersburg, a territory belonging
" to Russia should give asylum to the bitterest enemies of the
" Russian Empire . . . I preach no sharp, coercive measures against
" Finland. My fullest sympathy is due to the land and its culture.
" But we cannot ignore our own interests. Unless Finland itself
" adopts the right course, well, we must do it. And as a very extreme
" measure I look upon the lopping off of the province of Vyborg from
" Finland, and its incorporation in the Russian Empire. Let us
" hope that we shall not find it necessary to have recourse to severe
" measures, and that the Finnish people, awaking to a correct
" appreciation of the situation, may themselves do what is reasonable
" within a reasonable time."

From such expressions of opinion as these it seems reasonable to conclude that the Duma will look upon the " abnormal " relations between the two countries from a business point of view. Sentiment will play but a slender part in its decision. What the deputies who have hitherto spoken out on the subject complain of is that Finland regards Russia as a foreign and an almost hostile country, connives at the criminal machinations of Russia's enemies, deprives Russians of the full rights of citizenship in Finland, disqualifies them from settling on Finnish territory and from entering the Finnish civil service, and now, not satisfied with the present measure of home rule, which enables them to tax Russian commodities and keep Russian citizens out of their service, is moving heaven and earth in order to sever all the bonds that link the two countries together, excepting that of a personal union.

One abiding cause of friction between Finland and Russia is the antagonism between the democratic, almost socialistic spirit of the one, and the monarchical leanings of the other. In the relations between two such political communities, form is a more important factor than is usually supposed. Almost all the concessions obtained from autocratic Russia during the nineteenth century were won by suasion. And in the twentieth century nothing will be wrested from constitutional Russia by force. On that ground, if on no other, the answer of the Finnish Diet to the greetings of the Emperor and Grand Duke on the occasion of the opening of that assembly on 12th February is perhaps open to criticism. The Speaker of the Diet having stated that the Finnish people is in the highest degree disquieted by certain events that are taking place, added: " Thus, " to one of the highest positions in our land a person has been " appointed—and appointed by means of a deviation from the procedure established by our laws—who took an active part in " introducing the regime which the Emperor and Grand Duke magnanimously abolished by his manifesto of November, 1905." To

Russians that passage is a stone thrown in the Emperor's grave; a Roland for his Oliver. He recently taxed the Finnish Diet with outstepping the bounds of the law. And now they retort, and retort publicly, solemnly and sharply. The Emperor is characterised as a law-breaker. The event alluded to by the Finnish speaker is the appointment of General Seyn to be deputy Governor-General of Finland, and General Seyn is cordially disliked there. This was an act of the Tsar's, performed, Russian jurists told him, in the exercise of the supreme power, and in strict accordance with law. Whether these legal authorities are right or wrong it is not for an outsider to decide. But even if we assume that they cannot prove their contention, the Emperor's advisers might plead the interests of the whole Empire of which Finland is a part. Against this argument, especially when backed by force, there is little to be urged. And it would be well for themselves if the Finns avoided everything calculated to warrant the Russians in having recourse to it. I, myself, lately heard a Russian politician discuss this subject. He was an ardent friend of Finland when she was under the heel of General Bobrikoff—and one of the declarations he made in my hearing was this: "The Finnish democracy may sympathise with our democrats. But if they go on harbouring revolutionists, and allowing them to weave plots and prepare outrages within a few miles of our capital, I, for one, am for reconquering Finland and incorporating part of it in the Empire."

For these reasons reserve and prudence may prove saving virtues.*

THE DUMA KNOWS HOW NOT TO DO IT.

Festina lente, with the stress on the second word, would seem to be the motto of the third Duma. No unbecoming haste, no unseemly eagerness marks its deliberations. Individual deputies and parliamentary committees seem to act conscientiously on the principles laid down by the truly great man: "devise your plans as though you had all eternity to work at their realisation." Another golden rule which they faithfully observe is: "begin with little and easy tasks and proceed gradually to the great and more difficult." And of the former they have over five hundred. Only on that supposition can it be explained that none of the burning topics of the time have yet been handled in the Tavrida Palace, neither the agrarian question, the labour problem, the Habeas Corpus Bill, nor any of the grandiose legislative acts which derive from the formative principles of society. The apparently sacred fire which gleamed and glowed in the Tavrida Palace two years ago is extinct, and in its ashes one

* Since this article was written the Governor-General of Finland, Gerard, whom Count Witte had appointed, has been removed; General Boeckmann has been put in his place with full command over all the troops in Finland, and a new system of government has been begun.

descries tokens of the stubbornness of dull despair. One of the first problems on which the nation's legislators deliberated was whether certain nuns in the south of Russia, when afflicted by colds in the head and other ills, should get their physic at the cost of the State or pay for it themselves. Another matter which the national assembly pondered over had to do with the rent of a house which some fourth class civil servant, in a far distant town, had occupied and would like to quit. And these are typical specimens of the Bills duly passed by the legislative assembly.

Indolence and indifference are the traits which at first hostile critics and then warm friends pointed out as characterising the third Russian parliament. At Christmas, after a few weeks' fruitless labour, the Duma adjourned for several weeks, and on the day fixed for the resumption of business the majority was still absent from the capital. And of the Bills passed by the lower chamber not one could be laid before the Council of the Empire because they were not properly drawn up. And they were not drawn up because the drafting committee never managed to meet. Twenty-six parliamentary committees exist, and all these together had held only fifty-five plenary sittings down to the 26th January, and the number of reports they had set down on paper was but seventeen. These seventeen reports occupied only thirty-four printed pages, and one of the principal press organs calculated that as 350,000 roubles had been paid to the deputies down to mid-January, each page cost the nation 10,000 roubles, which is more than £1000. These things were at first hinted at by the press and then openly censured. Thereupon a member of the centre, M. Shubinsky, accused the press of bringing the Duma into contempt, and gave utterance to his conviction that it ought to be muzzled.

Then the speaker, M. Khomiakoff, spoke out plainly and endorsed the general verdict. Some deputies, he complained, seem to have forgotten the very existence of the Tavrida Palace; the committees go to work without any plan, and he, the speaker, is powerless to introduce order and method. "Simultaneously with the important bills," he remarked, "there are five hundred and ten insignificant bills which have long been waiting their turn. It is now in the Duma as at railway stations after a snowstorm of two years' duration—they are all blocked with snow and crowded with trains that cannot start. If the third Duma clears the road, it will have merited well and deserved a monument. Meanwhile, I for my part look upon the prospects pessimistically. At present it is impossible to pass on to the Council of the Empire any one of the eleven bills already approved by the Duma, solely because the drafting committee has not once come together. In other committees the same sort of thing is going on—at this sitting some members appear, at that others. Hence the questions have to be

"examined several times *da capo*, and there is no progress. Others complain that they are members of no less than seven committees. Perhaps But nobody dragged them thither against their will. Then there are some deputies who since their arrival in St. Petersburg have never once entered the precincts of the Tavrida Palace. . . . Here in Russia everything is shortlived. There was a time when a keen interest was manifested in the Zemstvos. It passed and the Zemstvos are now forgotten. Nowhere in the community is any real active interest in anything noticeable. Everything is put on. And it is just the same with the Duma. On the other hand, how can a man love music who has never heard its strains?"

THE STOLYPIN CABINET IS A FIXTURE.

If I were a Russian progressist I should not worry over this Laodicean spirit of the Duma; for it benefits the cause of democracy as nothing else could. An assembly like the second or the first would damage the cause by boldly seizing upon some republican or quasi-anarchist principles, endeavouring to embody them in legislation and risking the very existence of representative institutions in Russia. But the third Duma will stumble on, groping its way, creating merriment here and there, but provoking no serious enmity in any quarter, just as Lucius Brutus lived on in ancient Rome unmolested as a feeble-minded wight, until the fatal hour struck when he drove the king into banishment and put an end to the monarchy altogether. All that is really essential to the success of the democratic cause is that the third Duma should live on. How it lives, how it acts, are secondary matters. That it should continue to be is the one thing needful. Afterwards it will grow more liberal; still later it will reform the legislation, or be dissolved for tackling the work, and then, when the *present type* of Duma will have taken root in the land, a new electoral law must be issued—the present law being impossible—and M. Stolypin's progressive programme carried out whether its distinguished author is or is not at the head of the Cabinet.

Recently there were persistent rumours that considerable changes in the Cabinet were impending, including the resignation of the Premier himself. But nobody acquainted with the present condition of things gave them credence. That such a change is desirable and might be highly beneficial is the belief of most well-informed people who consider the interests of Russia as a whole rather than the aspirations of a party or clique. But that belief, nay, that conviction, goes for nothing. Indeed, if it were known that Russia would stand a good chance of recovering from all her wounds as a consequence of a change in the Premiership, that knowledge would at most call

forth a vain desire. For the question that would arise if the Premier were gone is, "Who is there to take his place and to play the rôle which hitherto has been his? Who could maintain the relative tranquillity which he has established?" As though the lull in the anarchist movement were the effect of any one cause! It must, however, be admitted that the choice of a tolerably suitable chief of the Cabinet—if there must be a Cabinet—is more difficult for the Crown than it has been since the Cabinet was first created. But when Count Witte's resignation was talked of a couple of years ago, people likewise anxiously enquired who was left in Russia to take his place, and everybody looked blank. Again, when M. Stolypin was appointed to succeed M. Goremykin many shrugged their shoulders and derided the notion of entrusting the fortunes of the Empire to an untried official. Well, as then, so now, there are men available for the post, new men, too, who really understand the requirements of the Empire and seem capable of infusing *ichor* into the veins of the national organism. Fate, however, appears to be against them and also against the Empire. Instead of an historic epoch, therefore, Russia will pass through a period of transition. And for such a period the present Cabinet is admirably fitted.

THE PREMIER IS STRENGTHENED BY THE SUPPORT OF THE LEFT.

One sign of the times is too suggestive to be passed over in silence—for like a straw it shows how the wind blows: the support extended by the Opposition to M. Stolypin. When the dismissal of the Premier began to be believed in St. Petersburg a few weeks ago, the oppositional parties were painfully surprised, and caused their newspapers to set to work to defend him against the virulent attacks of the Conservative Press—him whom they themselves had but lately been subjecting to unsparing criticism. The ordeal happily was short. And when the clouds were dispersed and the danger dissipated, the Opposition breathed a sigh of relief that M. Stolypin was still firm in the saddle. Their good wishes have sensibly strengthened his position. And rightly. If, as now seems probable from all this, the Crown is minded to come to terms with the more moderate elements of Liberalism in the land, to accustom the country to representative institutions, and to introduce, little by little, progressist legislation of a mildly democratic and state-socialist character, without consciously encouraging federalist tendencies, it would be a grave mistake to make any such changes in the Cabinet as were foreshadowed by recent rumours. The present Premier is a moderate, sound Liberal, a self-denying patriot, a Russian opposed to federation on principle, and a loyal subject of the Tsar who has shown himself qualified to carry out a popular programme with due

circumspection. At the same time, however, it is but right to add that there is a monarchical party in the country—a party immeasurably superior to the monarchical party in the Duma—to which Liberalism and democracy are an abomination. These men, who are numerically very strong in the bureaucracy, hold that the Stolypin Cabinet and its policy is pernicious to the Empire. Some of these are fanatical and prepared to make heroic sacrifices to thwart the success of the democratic movement; others are resigned to the will of the monarch.

THE NAVY BILL AND THE DUMA.

The dissolution of the Duma was another of the contingencies recently mentioned by the opposition press as in sight. The ostensible grounds of this far resonant measure would be the certain refusal of the nation's representatives to sanction the vast expenditure required for the reconstruction of a powerful navy. During the late campaign fifty-six battleships, representing a total of 249,000 tons displacement, were lost to Russia, besides a considerable number of auxiliary vessels. Since then vessels representing in all 145,000 tons displacement have been built. At present then the tonnage of available line-of-battleships amounts to 161,000, that of cruisers to 126,000, and that of the torpedo flotilla to 54,000, while transports and other subsidiary vessels have in all 253,000 tons displacement. To man these vessels a force of 57,000 men is needed, whereas the admiralty disposes of only 47,000 owing to the new system recently adopted. In a word, Russia's navy is small out of all proportion to the extent of her territory—one-sixth of the globe—to the length of her seaboard (28,500 miles) and to the effective strength of her land army. The Crown—most of the Great Powers owe their navies to the chief of the State, not to the Parliament—aware of this disproportion, is naturally anxious to right it, and alleges as grounds the need of defending the coast line, the impossibility of waging a thoroughly successful war, defensive or offensive, against any of Russia's probable enemies without a formidable fleet, and the circumstance confirmed by history that nations which lost their sea power invariably lost their internal rank as well. These reasons are convincing, and the Premier accordingly introduced a bill authorising the Marine Ministry to set to work to rebuild the navy. But here the other sides of the question came full into view—the ruinous cost of the work and the slender sources from which the money can be drawn. Two hundred millions sterling as the total cost is hardly too high an estimate. Doubtless the sum would be spread over a number of years, but divide it as one might, it would still constitute such a drain on the country that most of the internal reforms, including army reorganisation itself, would have to be postponed, and not for a year or two, but for at least a decade. That is one objection.

Then there is the difficulty of building the ships. As the Russian shipbuilding works are not considered to be up to the mark or capable of turning out thoroughly trustworthy vessels, it would be nationally suicidal to entrust the work to them. On the other hand, no patriotic government could send such vast orders out of the country at a moment when the native industry is passing through a severe crisis. Out of this difficulty there is perhaps a practical way; one might invite one or other of the best foreign ship-building firms to take over the Russian concerns, and in this way the order would be carried out satisfactorily and the money kept in the country. But even then the most important problem would be unsolved—how to get the money yet leave unexhausted the financial sources without which the internal reforms cannot be accomplished.

On the strength of these difficulties the deputies will probably refuse the Minister's demands categorically. If so, politicians argued, the Cabinet must either veer round and definitely abandon the Navy Bill or else dissolve the Duma. And of the two evils it will certainly choose the latter. To this line of argument are due the rumours of a speedy dissolution. But, in reality, few contingencies are less likely to happen than this. The policy of the moment might be summarised as that of letting sleeping dogs lie—*quida non movere*. Moreover, the Cabinet is as thriftily disposed as the Duma. It grudges every copeck spent on any but domestic legislation. It has to bear carefully in mind the effect which each money vote will have not only on the agrarian, judicial, labour, educational and other reforms, but also upon the credit of the Empire abroad. Moreover, the Cabinet does not include among its members the Ministers of War, of the Marine, of the Imperial Court or of Foreign Affairs. No wonder then that the Premier had the announcement bruited abroad that the Duma may reject the Navy Reorganisation Bill without entertaining any fear of unpleasant consequences. But why, in that case, take up the time of the Chamber with a bootless discussion?

E. J. DILLON.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND ITS CURE: THE FIRST STEP.

THE past few years have been years of unexampled prosperity and perpetual distress. Exports and imports have mounted steadily to new heights. Distress Committees have year after year registered and relieved thousands of the unemployed. Explanations of this contrast may be offered; that statistics of foreign trade illustrate only part, not the whole, of the industrial activity of the nation; that special occupations—notably building—are being affected by new processes. The central paradox of the unemployed problem lies deeper. Not only in the last few years, but over the whole period for which accurate economic records are available, there has been a rise in the standard of wealth and of production. Wages have increased; the consumption of raw material in all the principal manufactures has grown more rapidly than the population; the average income and the average productivity of the individual citizen are higher than they ever were before. The terrors of over-population—of a rate of births out of all relation to the rate of industrial expansion, of each fresh comer finding room only at the cost of diminishing the room of others—have been laid to rest by the apparently limitless improvements of manufacturing methods and organisation. Industry still expands not less rapidly but more rapidly than the population. Each fresh comer finds on an average not less but more working and living room than his predecessors. Yet with all this there comes the perpetual cry of some who find no living and working room at all. While the number of those who can and do obtain employment rises endlessly, the number of the unemployed never falls to zero.

The suggestion is inevitable, that there can be no such thing as genuine unemployment. If there are not too many workmen in the country every man who really wants work must be able to obtain it. Those who fail to find room while fresh room is opening out all around them must be men either unfit or unwilling to do so. They must be “unemployable”—the inefficient, the lazy, the sick and infirm. This suggestion, however, runs counter to facts at least as incontestable as those of the growing wealth and productivity of the nation. It cannot

be supposed that the 30,000 members of highly skilled and organised trades who at the present moment are returned as unemployed and for the most part in receipt of out-of-work pay from their unions, are all unemployable. It cannot be suggested that the employers who write to Distress Committees, as they do write in hundreds and thousands, giving the characters of men now out of work but formerly employed by them, are all in a conspiracy of deceit. Unemployment is not to be explained away as the idleness of the unemployable. As little can it be treated as a collection of accidents to individual work-people or individual firms. It is too widespread and too enduring for that. While the steady absorption of the growing population in growing industry is accepted as still happily the rule, it is equally necessary to admit the existence of facts modifying the completeness of this absorption at certain times and places—indeed, at all times and places. There is no general want of adjustment between the natural increase of the people and the expansion of industry, between the rate of supply of fresh labour and normal growth of the demand for it. There are specific imperfections of adjustment which are the economic causes of unemployment.

One of these has long been recognised. While industry, as a whole, grows, specific trades may decay, or change in methods and organisation. The men who have learnt to live by those trades may find their hard-won skill made a drug on the market and themselves permanently displaced from their chosen occupations, while lacking both the youth and the knowledge to make their way into new occupations. "There cannot," said John Stuart Mill, "be a more legitimate object of the legislator's care than the interests of those who are thus sacrificed to the gains of their fellow-citizens and of posterity."

A second type of mal-adjustment between the demand for and the supply of labour is found in actual fluctuations of industrial activity. Many trades, perhaps most trades, pass regularly each year through an alternation of busy and slack seasons, determined by climate or social habits or a combination of both. Building is slack in the winter and busy in spring and summer. Printers find least to do in the August holidays and most in the season just before Christmas. At the London Docks timber comes in at one time of the year; fruit at another; tea at a third. Behind and apart from these seasonal vicissitudes of special trades, and affecting, though in varying degrees, nearly all trades at about the same time, is a cyclical fluctuation in which periods of general depression—1868, 1879, 1885-6, 1893-5, 1904-5—alternate at intervals of six to ten or more years with periods of feverish activity—1872-4, 1881, 1889-1890, 1899-1900. The causes of this phenomenon are here beyond discussion. The phenomenon itself must be accepted as for the present inevitable. Modern industry appears able to grow only through a succession of periods of rapid expansion followed by actual or relative contraction. Workmen are

not wanted one year who were wanted the year before, and who may expect to find themselves in demand again a year or two hence.

These two elements in the unemployed problem have long been familiar. A third, apparently far more important than either the occasional transformations of industrial structure or the periodic fluctuations of industrial activity, has at last been brought into prominence by the administration of the Unemployed Workmen Act. Among the applicants coming before the Distress Committees established by that Act there are generally some who have within recent years lost a regular situation, and have lost it either through a change of industrial methods—*e.g.*, a new machine, or through a reduction of staff or failure of their employers in bad times. The great bulk of the applicants are not in this position at all. The great bulk are not men for whom distress is exceptional or regular employment the rule. They are men constantly in or on the verge of distress. They are men normally in irregular or casual employment, getting from time to time some work, getting, no doubt, more work in good years than in bad years, but never getting it regularly or in sufficient quantities to provide a decent living. It should by now be unnecessary to support this statement by elaboration of testimony. The evidence for it abounds in all the reports of Distress Committees. It is the one point of agreement between those who make it a ground for more and those who make it a ground for less State action on behalf of the unemployed. All who see what they are doing at all see that the provision of temporary relief work is a mockery of the real needs. For the new relief authorities, whether in London or outside it, the problem of the unemployed is not, except in small part, the problem of the exceptionally distressed regular workman. It is the problem of persistent poverty—the poverty not of low wages but of irregular earnings, aggravated, no doubt, in certain months and years, but always draining into it all the unfortunate, the untrained the vicious, accentuating and perpetuating all their weaknesses, excluding all human possibility of self-help or escape. The question overshadowing all others is that of the general or casual labourer, his cause, character and cure.

This question must be examined for a moment more closely. The casual labourer of to-day is a part of industry, not outside industry. He cannot be regarded as unemployable so long as he is occasionally employed. He cannot be regarded as individually superfluous since his services are occasionally in demand. His irregularity of employment cannot be attributed directly to want of willingness on his part to work regularly; were he never so willing he would be dismissed when his day's or week's job was done. He is falsely described as always unemployed; his true description is that of a man under-employed. A man always unemployed, that is wholly superfluous and lacking private means, would—since neither charity nor a wife's

earnings can last for ever—be driven to the choice between the work-house and emigration. The casual labourer persists indefinitely because with the present organisation or disorganisation of employment there is an effective demand for him where he is and as he is; because he fills a place, though only a half place, in industry; because even when standing idle he is in reserve rather than superfluous. No doubt there is, according to the report of the Distress Committee, "a permanent excess of unskilled labour over the demand" in Bermondsey as in every other part of London and in every great city, but the excess in its present form is one of aggregate labour power, not of labouring individuals. It shows itself in the chronic under-employment of many rather than in the total unemployment of a few. There are always men out of work; there are no men out of work always. An excess of this character does not and cannot bring its own cure by leading to the migration of labour. None of the individuals affected are likely to go elsewhere while on the one hand they are left without information or means of information as to where to go, while on the other hand there is always for every man the chance of a day's work at the riverside. If any can be prevailed on to go, there is nothing whatever to prevent their places from being filled again by a fresh generation of the distressed; the potent attraction of jobs always offering remains. All hope of a remedy depends upon looking at the evil from its positive side, not its negative side; in seeing the casual labourer not simply as unemployed, but as a man badly employed, under-employed, the subject of a persistent social disease strictly analogous to sweating.

This, then, is the problem, or rather these are some of the several distinct problems of unemployment. They have been set out in historical order—the order in which they have succeeded in obtaining general recognition. First, it was seen that the growth of industry, by the change and decay of its constituent parts, might involve in unmerited hardship those thereby displaced once for all from their chosen occupations. Next, it was seen that apart from these changes of structure, and apart also from the seasonal vicissitudes of particular trades, industry as a whole was marked by regular pulsations of activity; and that retardation or checking of its normal growth in recurrent periods of depression induced recurrent periods of slack employment. Finally, it has come to be seen that the incessant variations in the demands for men made by a multiplicity of separate employers, in many separate markets, involves the creation and the maintenance of a standing reserve of labour always insufficiently employed. In considering their solution, these problems have to be taken in the reverse order, the order of practical importance. The unemployed for practical purposes are the applicants to the Distress Committees established by the Unemployed Workmen Act. These applicants may be slightly worse off in a bad year than in a good year,

in winter than in summer. The predominant fact about the great majority of them is that they belong to a class always badly off, always living from hand to mouth, always passing into and out of employment, always insufficiently employed. They show the paradox of unemployment carried to its furthest limits—carried to the point at which it ceases to be a paradox at all. There would be nothing paradoxical in a perpetual growth of industry and of the demand for labour though every man by law could work only five hours a day, that is to say, stood idle half his time. The men who now stand idle half and more than half their time as casual labourers are part of current industry. They are not available as a force for growth. They are chained down to their half-places by ignorance and habit more binding than any law.

What, then, is to be done for this class? How is under-employment to be treated? There is obviously nothing to be done either for or with the under-employed class except to abolish it. There is obviously, if the foregoing analysis be accepted, no way of abolishing the under-employed class except by abolishing the system of employment which produces it and depends upon its existence. The casual labourer is the rock upon which all hopes of thrift or self-help or trade union organisation, no less than all schemes of public assistance, are shattered. The provision of temporary relief, whether in the form of work under the Unemployed Workmen Act or otherwise, is clearly useless, because there is no further shore of good employment upon which the casual will land naturally at its close, and is worse than useless, because it increases his immobility. The removal of the under-employed, whether to Canada or to rural England or to permanent national workshops, may benefit the men removed, but leaves their half-places to attract and to be filled by fresh comers. If the making or finding of new openings for labour would solve the unemployed problem, why is it unsolved to-day? Private enterprise is perpetually making new openings for labour; that is the one thing which it does really well. Industrial training is undoubtedly a good thing, and its extension may do something to diminish the supply of casual labourers, yet, while the demand for them continues, it is not to be supposed that the sources of supply can ever be dried up. The supply is drawn from all who at any time, in any trade, are in temporary difficulties, from all who have failed and from all who, very largely because they are the children of casual labourers, have never fairly started in life. Thrift, sobriety, adaptability, initiative, are all good things. They are all too good for the casual labourer. An individual here and there may always rise superior to overwhelming odds. The mass is inevitably demoralised by a system of employment which panders to every bad instinct and makes every effort at good hard and useless; which by turning livelihood into a gamble goes far to take from idleness, slovenliness and irresponsibility their punishment, and from assiduity its reward. All assistance or removal

of distressed individuals is as irrelevant to the industrial evil of under-employment as it is to those of sweating wages or insanitary workplaces. What would have been thought in 1830 of a project for curing the evils of factory life by emigrating the operatives?

It is necessary to abolish casual employment itself, just as it has been necessary to abolish excessive hours and insanitary conditions in factories. It is necessary to provide that every man who gets work at all shall as a rule get sufficient to carry him through. The proposal will be scouted at once as impossible without a complete reconstruction of the industrial order. Is not employment casual simply because business is fluctuating? How can an employer avoid taking men on irregularly so long as the custom comes irregularly, so long as fogs and tides and frosts and the countless vagaries of the host of consumers are in the order of things? The answer is that the individual employer cannot, unless he is to pay men for standing idle most of their time, employ regularly every man whom he employs at all, but that there is nothing to prevent all whom he employs from getting regular or at least far more regular work than now—*if not under him, yet under him and a number of other employers in turn.* Separate businesses employing similar classes of labour, though they may be affected to some extent by general events (*e.g.*, by seasons or trade changes), so as all to grow slack or all to grow busy at the same moment, are to some extent also affected by events peculiar to each, so that one grows busy while another grows slack, one is dismissing men while another is taking them on, one needs ten men to-day whom it does not need to-morrow, while another needs ten men to-morrow whom it does not need to-day. If in the last illustration the two employers take on their men independently at different places the two days' work may go to two distinct sets of men—twenty in all; each employer, indeed, will tend to have a distinct following in constant attendance at his gates. Then will result the phenomenon which in fact is so apparent in the experience of Distress Committees, of a perpetual reserve of labour, none wholly unemployed yet always some without work—A's men idle to-day, B's to-morrow. If, on the other hand, both employers take their men from a common centre or Labour Exchange, both days' work may go to one set of men—twenty men idle half their time may be replaced by ten men in continuous work. It is of no use to halve working hours of an employer, on the ground that he needs two hundred men this week and only one hundred next. That simply leaves him with a demand for four hundred men this week and two hundred next. An eight hours' day may be desirable for other reasons; as a device for absorbing the chronic excess of labour it is out of place. The only remedy in the example given is to find some other employer who wants one hundred men this week and two hundred next, and the way to find that employer is to get all employers to register their needs for casual men at a common centre.

There is nothing mysterious or revolutionary or impracticable in this. It is an empirical fact, obvious on reflection, demonstrable and repeatedly demonstrated by simple arithmetic, that the business of independent employers of the same class of labour does fluctuate independently; men do pass from one firm to another. It is a commonplace of business organisation that a firm with many departments may use a man, now in one department, now in another, and if it absorbs fresh business or adds new departments may continually go further in regularising the employment while proportionately reducing the numbers of those employed.

A Labour Exchange or common taking-on place for many businesses may do as between them what in a single firm is done as between different departments. It may become the headquarters of a small mobile reserve of labour, replacing and by its mobility covering the same ground as the enormous stagnant reserve which fills the streets to-day. The larger and more varied the area of employment covered by an Exchange, the more completely will it be able to regularise the work of this reserve, because the more nearly will the independent fluctuations of many businesses neutralise one another so as to yield a steady average. The London and India Docks Company, in reorganising their staff on the lines of the present proposal, found that every increase of the unit for taking-on purposes—from the gang to the department, from the single department to the dock, from the single dock to the whole system of docks, increased the possible proportion of regular to casual employment. They now do 80 per cent. of their work by regular men as against 20 per cent. or less in the days before the Dock Strike. There are, of course, limits to the possible movement of labour—limits of space and limits of technical skill. Men cannot be transferred in a morning from London to Manchester or from carpentering to bricklaying. But while the requirements of special skill sets limits to the range of movement, it also makes a large range of movement unnecessary. It is harder to regularise skilled employment than unskilled; but the skilled workman, because of his higher wages, can stand greater irregularity without falling into distress. The casual employment of the barrister or the doctor, the artist or the journalist, does not lead directly to the workhouse. Moreover, it is not necessary to argue that all irregularity can be abolished by simply organising the movement of labour, or that nothing will remain to be done later. It is sufficient to say that every step in this direction is a step in advance. Whenever any two wharfingers, by using a common list of casuals, reduce the number of individuals between whom their work is shared from fifty to forty-nine, they have to that extent reduced under-employment.

In practice, then, the rule must be established that all men who cannot be guaranteed a reasonable sufficiency of work by one employer should be engaged only from an Exchange, in touch with many

employers. The State having diagnosed the disease of under-employment—an indirect form of sweating, far worse than the direct form—must lay upon employers the responsibility of either themselves preventing the occurrence of the disease, or of putting the State in a position to prevent it. If an employer's work is already regular, if he can make it regular, if by combining with others to set up a private Labour Exchange he can distribute his own irregular work and that of others so as to give a sufficiency of employment to all who are employed by him at all, he may go his own way rejoicing. It is expensive and unnecessary to insist upon managing an employer's business for him, so long as his own method of managing it does not cause a nuisance to his neighbours—does not, in the present instance, involve the production of under-employment. But if an employer cannot, either by the reorganisation of his own business or by combining with others, arrange to do without casual hands, he must be asked to take on these casuals only from a public Labour Exchange and never from the streets. It will then be for the Labour Exchange to organise the whole supply of casual labour in its district. Whether or not it will be possible to get general consent to the use of the Exchange by persuasion alone, whether, in fact, de-casualisation can be brought about by the voluntary agreement of employers, or must be forced upon them by law, is a question which each man may answer now according to his views of human nature, but which can only be finally answered by experience. If the thing cannot be done voluntarily it will have to be done, and will be done, compulsorily. A new clause in the Factory Code, *e.g.*, that no man should be engaged for less than a week or a month unless he were taken from a recognised Labour Exchange, would be a legitimate and unobjectionable extension of the accepted principle: that the State may and must proscribe conditions of employment which are disastrous to the souls and bodies of its citizens. Such a regulation would not be open to any of the economic doubts affecting the legal determination of wages. It would not, like rules as to sanitation and safety, involve the employer in any expenditure; he stands to gain enormously rather than to lose by a system which will send to him for his casual work not the first ill-fed loafer from the streets, but a man who has just left another job. It would in no sense interfere with the employer's control of the staff; he might freely reject or dismiss any man sent to him. Theoretically, the change would limit the employer's choice of men; it is the very object of de-casualisation to diminish the number of individuals between whom a given flow of work is distributed. Practically the change would do nothing of the sort; no employer would in practice want to choose a man who had been idle for a week rather than a man sent to him fresh from another job, nor does any employer in practice concern himself at all about the individuality of his casual hands.

What, however, of the men themselves? Will they not object to registering regularly at an Exchange and being moved about from one job to another? Of course, those who have become habituated to a casual life will object at first to a regular life; of course, they will suffer some diminution of their existing freedom—the freedom to work one day and lie in bed, if it so please them, the next, the freedom to be disorderly and inefficient without affecting seriously their gambler's chance of work. But to allow any weight to this objection, or to regard de-casualisation as involving an exceptional or undesirable interference with the liberty of the men, is to ignore facts and common sense. The vast majority of the human race happily have to be regular at their work. The business of thousands of employees of all sorts—carmen, messenger boys, reporters, commercial travellers—is to appear daily at an office and thence go from place to place according to the orders of an employer.

No sympathy need be expended upon those for whom de-casualisation will provide regular instead of irregular work. The people who really deserve consideration are those who will be deprived even of the irregular employment which they have now. The essence of de-casualisation is to amend that wrong distribution of employment—the scattering of jobs over an army of irregular men—which lies at the root of the unemployed problem, and to amend it in the sense of replacing every thousand half-employed men by five hundred fully-employed men. On any view of society, it is better to have one man well-fed and capable than two on perpetual half-rations. If the country is not already full there must be room for more—*i.e.*, the five hundred men displaced will, in so far as they can work, eventually be absorbed in other work. If the country is already as full as it will hold, it is a matter of crying urgency to replace every thousand half-employed men (and potential fathers of families) by five hundred fully-employed men, while for the other five hundred no choice will, or should then be left except emigration. The ultimate desirability of de-casualisation is thus beyond question. The practical application of the reform, in a labour market heavily overstocked by the long continuance of a bad system of employment, will no doubt involve risk of hardship to individuals. It would be desirable to begin de-casualisation in a time of good trade rather than in one of bad trade, so as to give those displaced the best chance of at once finding other situations; the Labour Exchanges which as centres of de-casualisation brought about the displacement of those men would also be the best means of hastening their reabsorption elsewhere. Since many of those displaced, especially at first, would be men of a very low class, unfitted by privation and bad habits for immediate return to regular work, it would be necessary to have available some form of training or convalescent institution where those who had no other resource could

be dieted and disciplined into better ways. It would be necessary to have also the means of emigration, as being much the surest method now available for disposing of a genuine surplus of labour. Difficulties of transition there must be here as in every other case of transition from a less to a more efficient organisation of industry. Yet the difficulties may easily be exaggerated. In practice de-casualisation would proceed slowly, and could, in fact, be made to proceed at any pace thought desirable. There need be no visions of a vast unmanageable surplus thrown upon the hands of the community at a moment's notice.

At present, however, it is of more practical value to justify the organisation of the labour market in theory than to enter into details as to its practice. Labour Exchanges have failed in the past not because they were badly managed, though no doubt most of them were badly managed, but because there was no general understanding of the service which they might be expected to render. Once the value of the result to be achieved is recognised, practical difficulties will disappear in practice. There must be a wide-spread system of Labour Exchanges with an industrial not an eleemosynary standing. To stimulate the setting up of these Exchanges by local authorities or local associations of employers and employed, to give them standing and to secure their co-operation, there must be a central authority—in the natural course of things a department of the Board of Trade. The function of this department will not be to force Exchanges or the use of them upon all and sundry; it will be inspired not by the spirit of logical completeness, but by the determination to hit an evil when it sees one. Every employer shall be left at peace—till a virulent case of under-employment is traced to his factory. If a trade union does not want an Exchange to deal with its trade its wishes may be respected—so long as either through the activity of the union or otherwise the trade has no distressed unemployed. If a municipality does not want an Exchange it may remain happily behind the times—so long as it has no demonstrations of the unemployed, no mayoral appeals to meet exceptional distress, no stone yards and no relief works. But once it begins to write to the papers about its poverty, to ask for relaxation of the Poor Law or to say that the unemployed are “a national question,” down will come not a dole from the Exchequer, but an official from the Board of Trade to investigate the facts and to diagnose the disease. After that the municipality will, in eight cases out of ten, get a Labour Exchange—by persuasion or compulsion—to move its surplus of labour somewhere else and clear up its pool of under-employed reserve labour. In the ninth case the evil may appear to be of a really exceptional and temporary nature, to be met by measures of temporary relief. In the tenth case it may appear to be the result less of industrial conditions than of relief conditions. The industrial

investigator with power to compel industrial organisation should, for the sake of completeness, be accompanied always by an investigator of the Poor Law and of Charities to determine whether lax administration is in any way responsible for the perpetuation of poverty and to bring about a corresponding organisation of relief. This, however, is to enter upon a distinct though most important topic. The point to be urged here is that, sooner or later, nearly every great town will be found to stand in need of some organisation of casual industry. Though docks and wharves have been repeatedly mentioned above as typical centres of casual employment, the disease is really almost ubiquitous. It is not to be cured by the municipalisation of particular undertakings. It does not justify criticism of one set of employers as more thoughtless than others. Nearly every one at times takes on casual labour.

Moreover, the under-employment of the casual labourer is only the most developed form of a perfectly general economic phenomenon. It is the normal tendency of every occupation, whether skilled or unskilled, to become overstocked with men as the result of the unorganised demand of a multiplicity of employers. There are as many ways into an occupation as there are places in it at which men can get taken on. Fresh men get taken on at one factory while other men are being turned off from exactly the same class of work at another factory. Fresh men enter a trade in one town during a time of exceptional local development while men already in the trade are being turned off or standing idle in another town. The dissipation of the demand for labour in each trade between a number of independent employers actually increases its effectiveness in producing and retaining a supply of labour. It would be perfectly possible for every single occupation in a country to be overstocked with men, yet for the country as a whole to be in want of men for new occupations. It is, in fact, the normal state of every occupation to be thus overstocked, of every trade union to have unemployed men always on its books, of industry to work only with a margin of idleness. The tendency to overstocking is universal and persistent. Its effects may be counteracted for a time by the rapid growth of a trade and are always limited by the requirement of technical skill. The tendency itself can only be eradicated by the deliberate organisation of the labour market. From one point of view the question is that of increasing the mobility of the supply of labour. To increase the travelling power of workmen is to decrease for the individual the average leakage of time and earning power between one job and the next, and so to decrease the total number of individuals required to cover the fluctuating needs of national industry. From another point of view the question is that of concentrating the demand for labour so as to prevent fresh comers from being drawn or dropping into occupations already crowded, and to bring about the recruiting of

each trade in accordance with its total needs and not with local accidents.

The organisation of the labour market is not a cure for unemployment in all its forms. It cannot even when it applies directly stand alone. To some branches of the problem it does not apply at all. Labour Exchanges can do nothing directly for cyclical fluctuation of industrial activity, and little for seasonal fluctuation, except facilitate and regularise the movement from winter to summer trades, *e.g.*, the employment in gas works during winter of men who make bricks or are builders' labourers in the summer. On the other hand, even here de-casualisation may pave the way to a solution. By abolishing a class for whom saving and insurance are humanly impossible it may enable saving and insurance, aided by a wise distribution of public works, to cover the ground. Labour Exchanges, again, cannot prevent the coming of the new machines and new methods, nor can they prevent those subjective changes—of advancing age or increased liability to accident—which have the same effect of permanently displacing men from their chosen occupations. But they can obviously hasten as nothing else can the reabsorption of these men in other adequate employment; they can, if backed by public opinion, put the older men at once into touch with all the work which older men can do and which now, perhaps, for want of organisation falls to a younger man and wastes his youthful vigour and adaptability.

The organisation of the labour market is not a complete remedy for unemployment. Yet the question may fairly be asked whether every other of the remedies commonly applied or proposed is not either impossible or useless or dangerous without it. The elaboration of this question would extend the present article beyond all due limits. It must suffice in concluding it to repeat and to summarise in the fewest words possible the principal services which an efficient system of Labour Exchanges may be expected to render and the objects for which it appears indispensable.

1. The organisation of the labour market, by public or private action, by voluntary agreement or under legal compulsion, is necessary for the de-casualisation of employment. It is not possible for each business to employ only regular men. It is possible and necessary for every business to take all its irregular men from some common exchange in touch with other businesses, and administered with the object of giving all its clients a sufficiency of work, if not under one employer, then under many in succession.

2. The organisation of the labour market, though it cannot in times of depression make work, can even in such times reduce unemployment by abolishing all unemployment that is merely local in character. It can prevent men from being out of work in one place while employers are vainly seeking them elsewhere.

3. The organisation of the labour market is necessary for any drastic treatment of vagrancy. The excuse of the habitual vagrant is that he is looking for work. A national system of Labour Exchanges, using the post office, the telephone and the railway, will gradually relieve the habitual vagrant of the excuse, and the decent workman of the demoralising necessity, for going blindly on the tramp.

4. The organisation of the labour market is indispensable as a test of unemployment in the mass and in the individual. It alone can prevent measures for the relief of temporary distress from encouraging men to remain in trades or places in which they are not wanted, and so becoming measures for the perpetuation of chronic distress. It alone can record accurately the beginning, end and depth of industrial depressions. It alone by putting every man at once in touch with all the work that is to be had can safeguard against abuse of systems of insurance against unemployment or of honourable assistance to the unemployed in any other form.

5. Labour Exchanges in direct connection with the elementary schools are needed in order to organise and to guide the entry of boys and girls into industrial life, to give each a wider choice of the work for which he or she is best fitted, to study and to influence the character of the demand for youthful workers, to accumulate for the formation of public opinion or the framing of laws information as to the careers offered by various occupations.

From some points of view the organisation of the labour market is the logical extension of principles advocated by many different schools of thought. If the principle of the living wage means anything, it means not simply a minimum rate of pay per hour, but also a minimum average number of hours in the week and year. If the attack upon unorganised charity and casual relief is not to be wasted, it must be repeated in the industrial sphere; the process by which indiscriminate giving produces a race of beggars has an exact parallel in the manufacture of casual labourers by the offer of casual employment. If there is economic advantage in having known market-places for corn or wool or stocks, there must be the same sort of advantage in having such market-places for labour. Labour is the only commodity in the world which still finds a buyer only, or as a rule, by being hawked from door to door. The wastefulness of this antiquated method is obvious where, as is the case in skilled trades, an employer has sometimes to wait for a suitable workman. The waste is even greater, though unfortunately less obvious to the employer, in those occupations in which as many men as are wanted can be got at once wherever they are wanted, *i.e.*, in which all the waiting is done by an immense unorganised reserve of men.

From other points of view the organisation of the labour market

will be decried as a mere palliative. Yet those who are prepared so to describe it cannot do better than assist the palliative to demonstrate its own insufficiency. For the organisation of the labour market at least differs fundamentally from most palliatives in that its effect must be not to cover up, but to bring into stark prominence, the real problem, whatever that may prove to be. If those Tariff Reformers and Socialists are right who assault the existing industrial order at the one point at which it appears to the naked eye impregnable; if, in fact, the root of the disease is that industry does not grow fast enough and needs stimulating by the removal of foreign competition, or enlarging by the suppression of private enterprise, they can best prove their case by supporting a proposal which will force into the open the growing surplus which industry cannot absorb. If those are right who find the root of the disease in personal inefficiency, they cannot but welcome a plan for abolishing the half-places of industry into which inefficiency slinks and in which it is perpetuated. The proposals here made are first steps upon which all or nearly all may agree, however they differ as to the next step. There is one, and only one, type of opposition to them which is so well founded that it can be neither disarmed nor evaded. To the captain of industry who will have the courage to avow himself a sweater in intention and not by inadvertence, who to keep down the price of labour must always have forty half-starved men at his gates for the work of twenty, the advice can only be given with the utmost frankness that he should fight the organisation of the labour market tooth and nail.

W. H. BEVERIDGE.

THE AMERICAN SENATE AS A SECOND CHAMBER.

WHEN Lord Salisbury said of the American Senate, "I wish "we could institute it in this country: it is marvellous in "efficiency and strength," he expressed, no doubt, his momentary admiration for a Second Chamber whose chief merit just then was its total dissimilarity to the body in which he was sitting. Greater familiarity with American politics would have saved him from this anachronism. Possibly "the case of the Lords" would not now seem so desperate to political physicians, were they permitted to diagnose the secret ailments of the Second Chamber in the United States. If Mr. Bryce were to revise his classic study of the American Commonwealth in the light of present conditions, he would surely use the blue pencil diligently in those chapters which describe the workings of the two Houses of Congress.

It is high time that Mr. Gladstone's dictum regarding the origin of the American Constitution was dropped, for that remarkable organic law was not "struck off at one time by the mind and purpose "of man." It was based on more than a century of Colonial experience, and drafted by men whose practical sagacity prevented them, for the most part, from trying innovations. It is precisely those features of the Constitution, as writers on both sides of the Atlantic have pointed out, which were deliberate inventions that have failed most conspicuously. The Senate owes its origin and peculiar character, not to theoretical considerations regarding the bi-cameral system, not to a conscious imitation of the Parliament of Great Britain, but chiefly to the practical difficulty of securing the adhesion to the Federal Union of those little States whose interests were menaced,—so they supposed,—by the preponderating influence of the larger States in the proposed House of Representatives. The Senate was organised on the basis of State equality; and in order further to guarantee that equality an unamendable provision was added to the Constitution, to the effect that no State without its consent should be deprived

of its equal suffrage in the Senate. The Second Chamber of twenty-six members thus constituted was the visible symbol of the character of the Federal Union. In the early years of the Republic, it was unmistakably the less important body. Ambitious men sought seats in the House of Representatives, as the proper sphere for political activity. It was taken for granted that the Chamber elected by popular vote would assume some such relative importance to the Senate as the Commons to the Lords in the British Parliament. That was a natural supposition, for the Constitution provided that money-bills should originate in the House of Representatives; and if English history taught anything, it proved that political power followed the control of the revenue and expenditure of the State. And the House retained its predominance for a full quarter of a century after the organisation of the Government.

The rise of the Senate to a parity with the popular Chamber dates from the time of President Andrew Jackson, when the State legislatures, which under the Constitution form an electoral college for the choice of Senators, fell under the control of party organisations. So far from exercising an unrestricted choice, the State legislatures now simply register the will of the party having a numerical majority in the joint session of the two Chambers. In other words, the election of United States Senators has virtually ceased to be indirect. Whether it may be said that popular election of Senators has superseded indirect election, depends altogether on the view which one takes towards party organisations as a means of expressing the will of the people. For the moment this point may be waived.

It should not be forgotten that while the Constitution provides that bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, the Senate is explicitly given the power to propose amendments of these and other bills. Persistent use of this amending power has now practically given to the Senate also all the advantages of initiating money bills, so that the legislative equality of the two Chambers is, in all but theory, established.

The development of an unsuspected power as an executive Chamber has further saved the Senate from the inferior position to which it was relegated in the beginning. Through its power to confirm or reject nominations to office made by the President, the Senate has laid hold of the executive patronage and the influence which inevitably follows the possession of that power; through its power of approving treaties, the Senate has come virtually to share in the work of negotiating and framing treaties.

To the influence which Senators wield as distributors of the executive patronage should be added the prestige which membership in a select Chamber of ninety members gives, and the independence which comes from the comfortable assurance of a

tenure of office for six years and from the expectation of re-election.

These considerations would seem to confirm the impression of those observers who, counting the requisites of an efficient Second Chamber, find the American Senate to possess dignity, stability, influence, and—a quality lacking in the Lords—a natural basis for selection. Closer scrutiny, however, does not altogether justify the indiscriminating praise bestowed upon the American Senate in these particulars. A natural basis for selection, did indeed exist when the Federal Union was formed: a Chamber in which the equality of the States should be recognised was the *sine quâ non* of confederation. But the framers of the Constitution did not, and could not, anticipate the continental expansion of the Republic and the admission of thirty-two new States into the Union on an hypothetical equality with the original States. Many of these States, it is true, entered the Union on a parity with the original members in point of rights and privileges within the Constitution; some had passed as territories through a period of Federal tutelage, and had entered the Union under conditions which had never before been imposed. In point of population and natural resources, the greatest disparity existed among the new members of the Union. Some of these inequalities have been effaced by the shifting of economic conditions; others persist and are ineradicable. Yet in spite of gross inequalities the States have an equality of representation in the Senate—an irremediable equality. That this is not a merely academic difficulty of no practical importance can be easily demonstrated.

Nevada was admitted into the Union during the Civil War, after the discovery of the famous Comstock Lode. The rapid growth in its population, owing to the immense mineral wealth of the region, gave assurance, it was believed, of another California. At the census of 1880, Nevada had a population of 62,266; but with the apparent exhaustion of the Comstock Lode the population began to decline, so that the census of 1890 recorded a population of only 45,761. The last census shows a further decrease, so that the State now numbers fewer souls than the Borough of Richmond in New York City. Meantime, Nevada sends two members to the United States Senate, who may neutralise the vote of the two Senators from New York, representing over 7,000,000 people. If it be said that Nevada is an unhappy exception—it is the only State which is decreasing in population—the inequality of representation is still evidenced by other figures. There are represented in the Senate twenty-three relatively small States with a total population of 14,000,000 (in round numbers), and twenty-two large States with a total of 62,000,000 people. Thus forty-six Senators may outvote their forty-four colleagues, with the full consciousness that they are asserting the un-American policy of minority rule; and the

Constitution affords no mode of redressing the unjust balance of power in the Senate. Under ordinary circumstances, it is true, this combination would hardly occur; nevertheless, the possibilities of the situation are disclosed by a vote in the Senate on February 1st, 1896, when a Free Silver Bill was substituted for the Bill sent up by the House. Forty-two Senators voted for the substitution; thirty-five against it. Yet the minority represented nearly eight million more people than the majority.

Moreover, the provision in the Constitution whereby Senators are chosen by the legislatures of their respective States cannot be said to have worked happily. The framers of the Constitution sought to avoid a clashing of Federal and State Governments by creating a separate sphere of action for each. The Federal Government with its own officials was to act directly upon the people of a State, without interfering with the action of the State officials upon the same individuals considered as citizens of the State. Like a finely-constructed piece of machinery, the parts were to operate, wheel within wheel, to achieve a definite result. But when the statesmen of the Constituent Convention provided that the law-making body of a State should act as an electoral college for Federal Senators, they proved false to their theory, and prevented a clear articulation of the legislature as an organ of the State. As a seat in the Federal Senate became more and more a coveted honour, the temptation to subordinate local interests to Federal considerations proved too strong to be withstood. National party organisations penetrated the States and overwhelmed local issues by insisting upon the paramount importance of securing control of the Federal Senatorship. If this inevitable interpenetration of Federal and local politics has not entirely destroyed the efficiency of State legislatures, it is because the Senatorial tenure of office is six years, while the legislatures are chosen either annually or biennially. Not every legislature, happily, is elected under this direct pressure, though the need of maintaining the control of the legislature is never lost sight of by those who direct the work of party organisations.

It cannot be burked that thinking people in the States are profoundly dissatisfied with the Federal Senate. Rightly or wrongly, they have come to feel that members of the Second Chamber represent the people less than they represent privilege. Indeed, the growth of great industrial corporations, more or less dependent upon special legislation or upon immunity from regulation, has created conditions altogether unknown to the fathers. Obviously, the interests of these large corporations are subserved quite as well and quite as easily by representation in the Senate as in the House. So far as the railroads are concerned, vigilance in blocking unfavourable legislation, rather than special legislation, is needed. The broad basis of popular election, upon which the House of Representatives rests,

quired to
the control
State, just as in a regular election. Other States
have passed similar laws for direct primaries, but Oregon belongs the distinction of having put the expedient to a practical test in the nomination and election of a United States Senator. In 1906, each party nominated its candidate at a primary election; these nominations were then printed on the State ballot like nominations to State and county offices, and the candidate having a plurality of votes was declared to be the choice of the people for the Senatorship. Four years previously, the people had expressed their choice in much the same way, under the Act of 1901; but the legislature of the State refused to regard itself bound by this vote. By Constitutional law, the legislature was undeniably invested with the power to elect United States Senators. When the legislature, then, elected to the Senate a man who had not received a single popular vote, there was no legal redress for the disappointed voters of the State. So, too, in this election of 1906, there was no legal way by which the legislature could be bound to obey the popular vote, which technically was nothing but a recommendation. Not to be balked a second time, the citizens of Oregon hit upon a clever device to accomplish their purpose. On nominating candidates for the legislature, the parties availed themselves of the provision of the Primaries Act which permitted them to pledge their nominees always to "vote for that candidate for the United States Senator in Congress who has received the highest number of the people's votes for that position at the general election next preceding the election of a Senator in Congress, without regard to my individual preference." Should a candidate decline to accept such a pledge, the law provided that he might sign a second statement, to the effect that he would consider the vote of the people as "nothing more than a recommendation, which I shall be at liberty to disregard, if the reason for doing so seems to me to be sufficient." In the existing state of public

[REDACTED], the demand [REDACTED] by popular vote. [REDACTED] were a [REDACTED] departure from the Constitution, it is now wholly impracticable, for the simple reason that it would require a Constitutional amendment. That the Senate as at present constituted would pass a self-denying ordinance is not to be thought of; and no amendment can be proposed except by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress. To be sure, the Constitution provides that a Convention may be called to propose amendments, but this mode of amending the organic law has never been tried; and it is extremely doubtful if public sentiment is sufficiently strong to force the legislatures of two-thirds of the States to make the necessary application to Congress for the calling of such a Convention.

Meantime, certain experiments are being made which are full of suggestion to those who believe in the capacity of the American, like his English cousin, to change the content of old institutions without destroying their form. It is one of the conspicuous advantages of the Federal system that political experiments can be made by the several States without affecting the internal polity of other members of the Union. For many years those Southern States where but a single party organisation exists have witnessed no contests for the United States Senate except within the party. The real contest occurs between members of the party in pursuit of the nomination. Thus it has come about that the primary elections of the party have all the marks of a popular election for the Senate, for there is no recent instance of a failure on the part of a legislature to elect the man whom the popular vote has designated. The legislature simply registers the will of the party as expressed in the canvass for the nomination. It has not unfrequently happened that an acrimonious struggle for the nomination between several candidates, all of the same party, has been followed by the unanimous election of the successful candidate by the legislature.

Instructive as these instances are, they do not represent a normal

opinion, most candidates for the legislature hesitated to sign the second statement and affront their constituents, so that in the legislature which met after the election a majority were found to be pledged to obey the popular vote. The outcome was the election to the Senate of the candidate who had received a plurality of votes in the popular election.

It is easy to exaggerate the importance of this triumph. That the legislatures of other States will consent without a struggle to abdicate their Constitutional right to elect United States Senators is not likely. Even in Oregon, the outcome will be doubtful, if ever a Republican legislature is called upon to elect a Democratic candidate who has been endorsed by the popular vote. Nevertheless, in at least one notable instance a Federal Senator has been elected by popular vote, in the teeth of the express mandate of the Constitution.

Dissatisfaction with the Senate has never gone to the length of questioning the wisdom of the fathers in establishing a Second Chamber. The value of a revising chamber has been too often demonstrated to permit scepticism with regard to the efficiency of the bicameral system. Since the House of Representatives has ceased to be a deliberate body,—and one of the greatest speakers of the House thanked God for it,—the Senate has a graver responsibility than ever before in its history. With its opportunity for unrestricted debate, with its greater sobriety, and with its capacity for leadership, it should serve the Republic more effectively. But its efficiency will be measured by its success in convincing the people that it is amenable to popular control.

ALLEN JOHNSON.

THE PRESENT TENDENCIES OF FRENCH LITERATURE.

IF about the year 1830, a little before or after the battle of *Hernani*, some foreign editor had thought of interrogating a French writer upon the general tendencies of French literature, I imagine that the answer would have been easy and clear. The French author would have replied pretty much to this effect: "We have two opposite schools, the Classicists and the Romanticists. The one school is gaining and the other losing ground every day. The Classicists are bent on maintaining all ancient forms, as consecrated by tradition—the pompous Ode, the majestic Alexandrines, divided into two hemistichs and marching two and two; the tragedy with its three unities; academic eloquence and light poetry; such are the Conservatives. The Romanticists want to overturn all that; to crumble up the verse, to introduce a familiar style into poetry and eloquence and accurate expressions and the picturesque into language, to enlarge all boundaries and mingle all forms—these are the Revolutionaries." If asked to define more precisely the spirit of Romanticism and show in what essential points it differed from Classicism, our author would perhaps have found more difficulty; but he could at least have said that Romanticism was in revolt against social and moral as well as literary rules, that being strongly coloured by individualism it declared for the passions—whatever their objects or forms—a kind of worship which glorified them and thought of nothing less than using them to "purify the soul" as they used to say in Corneille's time; that it prized imagination more than reason, Shakespeare rather than Racine, the Gothic cathedrals above the Parthenon; and our questioner would have arrived at an idea sufficiently clear, though somewhat summary and simplified, of the two currents in French literature then in vogue; the one strong like a river continually swelled by new affluents and about to overflow its banks, the other like a rivulet whose source has run dry and which has only a few drops of water in its arid bed.

Let us suppose now that the same question had been put a quarter of a century later, say at the end of that year 1857 which witnessed the appearance of Gustave Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, of Charles Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du Mal*, and of Hippolyte Taine's first *Essays in Criticism and History*, all this coming two years later than the *Demi-monde* of Alexandre Dumas fils. It would still have been possible to reply without any great trouble. "Certainly," one would have said, "Romanticism is not dead, and its masters hold their prestige. Did not Victor Hugo only last year send to us from his place of exile *Les Contemplations*? Is not Michelet still the most admired of all who give themselves to recalling the past? Is not Georges Sand the most fashionable of romancers and Dumas père the most popular? And if Musset is just dead, is not Lamartine still alive and at work, though in old age? Nevertheless, it is obvious that the wind has changed. The Romantic rhetoric has had its day; the young writers avoid its grandiloquent declamations and look for expressions more nicely moulded to the thought; grand gestures, extravagant sensibility, tempestuous passion are coming to look a little ridiculous; people are trying to express with precision the sentiments which they feel without inflating them, to describe life as it really is, without embellishment or make-up; the refinements and methods of exact science tend to intrude into criticism, and it may be that the time is not far off when it will be proposed to apply to history and literature a procedure like that which is used in natural history." Again, anyone can easily make out the main outlines of the picture.

Let us pass over a somewhat shorter period. So many events have happened that ideas have moved faster. The Empire is fallen and the Republic installed—the Republic of which Thiers said—as was still believed—"The Republic will be Conservative or it will cease to exist." We are in 1878. Sully-Prudhomme is publishing *La Justice*, last year Emile Zola produced *L'Assommoir*, which has made a great stir, and is about to be staged, and Alphonse Daudet *Le Nabab*. Taine is working at the continuation of his *Origines de la France Contemporaine*. Brunetière has begun in the *Revue des deux Mondes* the series of his solid and vigorous articles. The splendid old age of Victor Hugo in its decline touches with gold what remains of Romanticism, like the rays of the setting sun falling on a ruin. Renan lends to everything that he touches the grace of his wonderful spirit. Dumas fils, Emile Augier, Sardou reign supreme at the theatre, where Henri Becque has already made his *début* with works which hardly seem to give promise of *Les Corbeaux*, the manuscript of which is waiting its time in the portfolios of the *Comédie Française*. It has become a more difficult task to disengage amid these various elements any common traits. But if the law of differentiation is at work as usual, if there is

a multiplication of programmes, if æsthetics are tending to split up, there is at least one word, one ticket, which forms the strategic point in the literary battle; it is the word Naturalism. Zola invented it, or at all events brought it out; it was he who had searched for its formula, and discovered it in the course of a somewhat rapid expedition into the *Médecine Expérimentale* of Claude Bernard. The word has made its fortune; it applies to philosophic as well as to literary tendencies. Zola indeed tries to introduce it into politics when he declares that the Republic "will be "Naturalist or it will cease to exist." Two camps are formed; people are for or against Naturalism. To be against it is not a positive programme; the army of the opponents is composed of very heterogeneous elements; it is not yet perceived that the same is also true of its partisans. Remarkable as are the works which it has produced, Naturalism has not lasted ten years. Its walls have been breached ever since 1885, ruin threatens it. Carried away by its doctrine, it had gone too far in the direction of positivism, and had withdrawn further and further from all interest in the inner life. Now come the psychologists, who are bringing back into credit the delicate or refined study of the feelings. Now come also the Moralists who discuss their problems. Naturalism disdains poetry, but Verlaine comes in with a growing reputation, and restores it to the favour of *les jeunes*; the symbolists and decadents unite or quarrel among themselves; small schools are multiplied like so many heretical chapels round a church. To answer the question supposed to be put, it would now be needful to adopt divisions and subdivisions, to take the risk of laborious definitions, to measure the degrees of yes and no, distinguishing different noisy doctrines which never enjoyed a to-morrow, or works whose renown is totally forgotten.

However, all these little chapels tumble down one after the other. We no longer even look for labels to stick on the bottles. One of them objects to all "isms," though these are so convenient; another to all "schools," though they bring such charming comradeship and help to make works known. Every one retires to his own corner and works for himself. Musset once said:

Je ne sais comment je vais je ne sais où.

This saying is more and more descriptive of every one. And here we see the first and most striking characteristic of our literature of the present day; it has no general tendencies which can readily be defined or explained. It moves because everything moves, it marches rapidly because everything marches rapidly, it evolves because everything evolves. But we must renounce the task of finding a formula for it, or stating in a few clear words in what direction or to what destiny it is moving. All that can be attempted

is to indicate a few luminous points which can perhaps be distinguished; and even so there is no little risk of deceiving oneself, as often happens when one attempts definitions of this kind.

* * *

But first it is necessary to insist on the first characteristic which I have just indicated—the lack of general tendencies. A phenomenon has appeared in our literature somewhat like what we have long since perceived in modern architecture: it is composite, disparate, formed out of elements the sources of which can be traced and which are not peculiar to it. The greatest success in our theatre in late years has been attained by a romantic drama—the best in my opinion of all romantic dramas—*Cyrano de Bergerac*, 1897. Two or three days after the triumph of this play, the brilliance of which remains unparalleled, one of the masterpieces of our psychological drama—I am tempted to speak of it as classical, almost Racinian—*Le Passé*, by M. Georges de Porto-Riche, passed almost without notice. From that moment various pieces in verse arose here and there, the form of which recalled that of *Cyrano*, and they reaped occasionally some of its success, but at the same time works of all sorts abounded, sad, merry, vulgar, realistic, fantastic, impressionist, plays with a purpose, comedies of incident, dishevelled plays derived from the old melodrama and popular plays derived from *L'Assommoir*. The public, teased and irresolute, threw itself now in one direction, now in another, hailing with joy to-day the thing it had hissed down yesterday, or vice versâ, unconscious of its own doings. The managers required the theatrical providers to change their style according to what was in vogue; either simultaneously or in turn every recipe was tried, just as people fly desperately to every remedy in a case of illness. A small number of writers, amongst whom should be mentioned the author of *La Course du Flambeau*, M. Paul Hervieu, held on their own way through this hustling, allowing none of these illusions of art or of success to solicit or distract them.

It is indeed on the stage that this phenomenon of dissipation is most striking, because there its characteristics are to some extent naturally exaggerated. But it must also be said of other branches of literature. For instance, we have only to run through the names of our best read poets amongst those who have made a reputation during the last twenty years: Samain, M. Henri de Régnier, M. Auguste Dorchain, M. Jean Richepin, M. Rivoir, Mme. de Noailles, Mme. Gérard d'Houville, M. Fernand Gregh, etc. We need only write down these names side by side to realise at once how distinctly impossible it would be to unite them under a common denominator. Exposed to the same influences, living at the same period in the same city and breathing the same air, one would almost say they had set themselves the task of disproving the theory of the medium in which most of them have been reared.

Nor is there any greater unity in the novel. Yet there, to speak truly, the technique has become, as it were, equalised; our novel writers have adopted forms which are similar or which at any rate might be grouped into several chief types. But the matter which flows through them is a product of many alloys. The one whose evolution has perhaps been broadest, M. Paul Bourget, began by re-establishing in a place of honour the old analytical novel (*Cruelle Enigme*, 1885); and now in his more recent books he appears to be returning more and more to the Balzac tradition. Amongst the rest there are some who carry on the line of Naturalism, and I should mention in that class an extremely remarkable but little-known book, *Les Circonstances de la Vie*, by M. C. F. Ramuz (1907); and there are some, like M. Elémir Bourges, who are moving towards Romanticism through the most refined æsthetics; some, like the Rosny brothers, lean readily on scientific theories and principles; some again, such as Mme. Marcelle Tinayre or the brothers Margueritte in some of their writings, remain above all things psychological; and others resolutely attack social problems, such as M. Marcel Prévost and M. René Bazin in their later books. And has not some attempt been made, in the footprints of M. Anatole France, to revive the philosophical novel and the libertine or philosophical tale of the eighteenth century? So that every path is being pursued, haphazard, and on this account one is forced to admit that there are no general characteristics outstanding in the run of the French novel of to-day.

It is possible that the increased diffusion of foreign literatures amongst us has partly contributed to the creation and maintenance of this incoherence. It is one of the most striking facts of the period in which we live—a fact it is very important to emphasise. Not that there is anything unique or new about it in the history of our literature; France has always been much more accessible to these infiltrations than certain critics are prepared to believe. She has hardly ever been exclusively herself except in her Classical period; before that she had become strongly “Italianised” and “Spaniardised” with Concini, Mazarin, the Corneille of the *Cid* and the *Menteur*, *les Précieuses*, Le Cavalier Marin. After that period the first Romanticists, breaking away from the degenerate Classicists, renounced their national masters, and went in search of models pretty well everywhere. But the models concerned were always relatively ancient: Dante, Shakespeare, Calderon. Their poetical matter had undergone the crystallisation of time. From the fact that they were not contemporaries, only the secrets of art, of form and of æsthetics could be sought from them; thus, less direct and further removed, their action could only be beneficent, and in fact it worked in very much the same way as that of the Greeks and Romans in the preceding age; they were followed from afar and their poetry was absorbed without being imitated. Very differently have things happened in

these latter years; the material which has come over the frontiers from foreign literatures has been quite hot and fresh; and its influence has at once become both more active and somewhat sterilising. Again, up till now, we have scarcely been acquainted with any but our nearest neighbours, those who issued, like ourselves, from the Latin or Carlovingian world. And now in the last twenty years we have seen the arrival of very different races, distant peoples, hitherto unknown, "new" in the true sense of the word, who are mingling with ours thoughts which have been governed by quite other influences, and ripened by other light and other skies. Is it surprising that these thoughts have disturbed and troubled us, drawn us from our normal circle and at times misled us and thrown us into excesses contrary to our true temperament? The intervention in our development of the Russian novelists, which M. E. M. de Vogüé has described in his famous and epoch-making book (*Le Roman Russe*, 1886), and then the intervention of Ibsen, have been facts of the first importance. We were aware of it soon enough, and for my part I had occasion to speak of it long ago. But what we perceived rather confusedly some fifteen years ago we can see more clearly to-day.

A well-informed critical study would have fine play in following out in our literature the traces of these invasions, and of others also. The very hour could be marked when certain general ideas, which later became common ground and have penetrated to our habits and even to our legislation, slow as it is to change, entered upon the scene and into our books—the "religion of human suffering," certain very Slav forms of pity, the "rights of the soul," the "duty to oneself," etc. It would point out that this intrusion of essentially "northern" conceptions had been correspondingly met by an energetic effort of our writers to break with the traditional framework of our literature which Romanticism had done less to shatter than it was apt to say, to enlarge its proportions and dimensions, to come nearer to the vast and variable forms in which the English or Russian novels move, to throw the stage open to moral problems out of which Ibsen had been able to produce such powerfully dramatic effects. In pursuing his inquiry the critic would indeed in no way minimise our writers, nor make them out mere imitators or pale reflections; he would simply show that at the period in which we live thought can nowhere, if I may venture to say so, be so nationally exclusive; and he would show this even in the case of the young masters who are most resolutely attached to French tradition and patriotism—of M. Maurice Barrès, for instance, who is impregnated with Germanism and yet does not cease to be a great French writer. Is this a good thing, or is it a misfortune? I cannot tell. The advantages and the disadvantages of railways, telegraphs, telephones and many other inventions which have, in the course of a hundred years, transformed

the conditions of our public and private life, may be discussed to infinity, and so may such things as democracy, universal suffrage, parliamentary *régime*, or personal and compulsory military service. But these things are facts, and whatever one may think of them in the tribunal of the conscience, they must be accepted and reckoned with. In the same way, perhaps, with time, these influences which seem to us full of peril to our taste and to our character, because they have not yet been assimilated, will in the end become unified and blended; perhaps there will come to be in the various tongues but one single "world" literature, as it has already been styled, and which has already several illustrious representatives; perhaps we shall see an increase in the number of writers whose works appear everywhere almost at the same time, and whose glory or popularity has no nationality. Such a result would not be achieved, on the other hand, without some wastage; it requires the sacrifice of strongly accentuated characters, of the most picturesque elements, of that local truth which is always so savoury, but which could not be equally interesting to all the capitals. For this reason I have difficulty in believing that good literature will gain in beauty if it continues its progress in the direction of cosmopolitanism. But it is not in this domain alone that a transformation is being accomplished, and that a prodigious monotony is spreading over the world. . . .

I said above that, feeling powerless to define with any precision the "present tendencies of French literature," I would endeavour at least to indicate some essential points which would be of assistance in seeing our way through the labyrinth. The invasion of foreign literatures, or, to speak exactly, of foreign contemporary writers, is the first, and its importance has been asserted more than once. I shall next describe the growing interest in historical studies of a particular kind.

This is not new either. During the romantic period a certain number of historical works contributed largely to the formation and diffusion of the new literary ideal; the names of Augustin Thierry, of the Lamartine of *les Girondins*, and especially of Michelet, suffice to recall all that Romanticism owes to history. Yet, with the exception of two or three celebrated productions, it remained in the background. The poets, playwrights and novelists already engrossed the largest share of the public favour. No historical success, not even *les Girondins*, can be compared with the success of such poems as the early *Méditations*, of dramas like *Chatterton* or *Anthony*, of novels like *Les Misérables*, or the *Juif Errant*, or even the *Trois Mousquetaires*. Again, these great historical works depended on no very strict method, nor even often on very careful documentary evidence; they were more like vast essays in which a great writer

expressed his thought by the artistic correlation of still recent events, which were known and which he knew often better from the yet palpitating accounts of witnesses than from authentic papers. His readers still felt the vibrations and shudderings in the atmosphere around them. History in these works was blended with the pamphlet, and it would have taken a good deal of trouble at times to trace the line of demarcation, so contagious was the passion which flowed through their ardent pages. Charmed to let themselves be carried along on irresistible currents, readers accepted them without criticism, infinitely more susceptible to the domination of talent than curious for information or desirous of seeking the truth.

Since those times, however, history has undergone a singular transformation. On the one hand it has enlarged the area of its investigations and perfected its method; on the other it has become intimate, unconstrained and specialised. We have historians who are, above all, learned men, such as MM. Seignobos, Aulard, Langlois; we have some who are also artists, like MM. Houssaye, d'Haussonville, Vandal, Masson; and we have others who are novelists as well, to look for what may be called the romances of history, or if you will, the dramatic events which are "human documents" rather than for historical documents, and they captivate their readers, as a novel does, by miscellaneous facts and *causes célèbres*. This form of history has greatly extended during the last few years; and it must henceforth be given a place side by side with the novel, whose long vogue it threatens, and whose great circulations it rivals. Besides, is not this good training? All forms of narrative are analogous; whether the writer draws on his inventive imagination or on his documents to defray the cost of his stories, he employs methods which are very similar. I would add that the fictions of the novelist may have their truth, and that *per contra* it is well to distrust the "truths" of history. The latter are indeed very uncertain, however perfect the methods employed. In dealing with facts, dates, politics, history may no doubt realise its programme, but then it only pleases the specialists, the inquirers and the learned. When it takes in hand personages—and that is what the public expect of it—its certainties are not much more solid than those of the novel; but they give the illusion of being so, and for that reason I think romantic history greatly pleases our contemporaries. In it they can nurse and delude their growing taste for exactitude, and lull their misgivings as to "what never really happened." The authenticity of established names and dates quickly throws events into dazzling light to their eyes. The historical apparatus succeeds in imposing on them. Its domain, they consider, is outside the imagination of the narrator; they ask for no more. It is with a slight contempt that we lay down the novel to open a history book. We are persuaded that the latter is less deceptive than the former. This may not be true; but what does that matter? Nothing

increases the intensity of one's emotions so much as to be in a position to believe or to imagine that one is not experiencing them for nothing, and that they have their foundation or their justification in "real truth."

One result which we may consider has been achieved by this great development of romantic history is the almost complete disappearance of the historical romance, which, however, is adorned by the books of M. Maurice Maindron (*Le tournoi de Vauxplassans, Saint-Cendre*, etc.). The expressions I have used serve to show that there is not much more in it than a transposing of words; but this transposition has perhaps a meaning which I shall endeavour to bring out in my conclusions.

In a country in which the affairs of public life arouse the most passionate interest, and in which the conflict of parties and the struggle of classes too often take a most violent form, one may expect to see social questions invade the field of literature. This is what has happened in fact—not, indeed, in poetry, which occupies a reserved territory, an "ivory tower" whose windows do not open on the street, but in the drama, and still more in the novel. This feature is doubtless no newer than the one last mentioned. Everyone knows the favour accorded to social literature during the Monarchy of July. It will be remembered that Georges Sand made herself illustrious side by side with Pierre Leroux, who was fighting on the field of action, and that Eugène Stie achieved in this line his most popular successes. But what is striking, what is peculiar to our day, is the degree of penetration attained by social ideas, the general interest they awaken, the ease with which they develop in regions from which they have hitherto been barred. Twenty years ago the reaction against Naturalism was marked by the revival of the psychological novel; to-day we see the very writers who started and worked that movement abandoning their studies of passion and sentiment to devote themselves to the problems, of an entirely different order, which exercise our hard-working democracy. M. Paul Bourget is the most striking example of this. None more resolutely than he shut himself up in his early days to the subterranean regions of the life of the intellect. Nor is there anyone to-day who has thrown himself with such intense mental struggle into the general consideration of the complicated processes of our new social organisation. That he examines it from the most resolutely and passionately reactionary point of view does not matter. What interests us is that this "psychologist" has become a "sociologist," and that the passions of the heart which formerly attracted him by the beauty of their play no longer affect him except in so far as they are connected with

public passions, or serve to explain them. At the other extreme is M. Paul Margueritte, whose case is no less significant. He also began with the psychological novel, with those moving and profound books entitled *Jours d'épreuve*, *La Force des Choses*, *La Tourmente*. And his recent works, written in collaboration with his younger brother, almost all seek to demonstrate some social theme, unless, like *Le Prisme* or *Vanité*, they are devoted to the study of the disturbances in the equilibrium of people's existence caused by the medley of classes and of fortunes. But here we see what is perhaps still more symptomatic. This delicate artist, having given an account of his childhood's memories, is not able to resist the unfortunate temptation to review them from his present angle of vision; and he has spoilt a charming book, a subtle and seductive study of a child's soul, for the pleasure of proclaiming himself a good Republican! M. Paul Bourget and the brothers Margueritte are diametrically opposed in their views of the social phenomena they observe; to the former these phenomena testify to a total disintegration; to the latter they announce the approach of a new era, in which there will be more happiness and more justice; but both the latter and the former put the same ardent zeal and the same preaching fervour into works whose forms do not lend themselves to such uses without damage. Legions block the way behind them, and what astonishes me is that we have not yet seen the dictum arise—a pendant to other celebrated formulæ, and one good enough to tempt our prophets—literature will either be social or it will cease to exist.

Social and political; since these two words are equally inseparable from one another, now because they mingle, and now because they are in contradiction. Politics besides are a powerful source of interest and of drama, a veritable passion which must now be ranked with other passions. In democratic countries especially it absorbs and devours a number of live forces. It spreads like a contagion, it is the soul of all great incidents, it increases the resonance of all the big trials, it is a marvellous "bouillon de culture" for all the microbes which move in the veins and viscera of the body of the nation. M. Jules Lemaitre in his *Député Leveau*, M. Maurice Barrès in his *Journée Parlementaire* and his trilogy *L'Energie Nationale*, M. Georges Lecomte in *Les Valais*, and many others in how many novels, plays and vaudevilles have striven to draw dramatic power or comic effect from this source; sometimes they have succeeded. Tragic events, violent catastrophes, "affaires" which have had a formidable notoriety, and one of which has perhaps changed the course of our destinies, prove how rich, varied, striking, terrible are the elements which politics afford to our art. The misfortune is that reality, an artist wiser than the cleverest, shapes this burning matter in such a way that no one can touch it after her without either extinguishing it or cooling it down. Amongst all the works inspired

by the great "affaires" of this later period—and every one knows there have been enough of them—I know only of the first part of *Leurs figures* in which the artist has been able to extract from his subject all the emotion which it carried. Except in that instance not one of them has given us such thrills as were furnished by the daily reports thrown together by hurried journalists who left all their eloquence to the facts themselves.

One of the most permanent characteristics of our literature is that it has always given an important rôle—one, if you will, out of all proportion—to the passions of love. The description of the struggles in which love engages in the conflict with duty, which never tires the French public, is the theme of almost all classical tragedy, and of the greater number of our famous novels, from the *Princesse de Clèves* by Madame de Lafayette to *La Maison du Pèché* by Marcelle Tinayre, passing by the *Lys dans la Vallée* of Balzac, *Valentine* by Georges Sand, and, indeed, how many others! This topic may, no doubt, still be found in our present productions, but it cannot be said that it is the whole soul or the whole marrow of them. The reason is that, slowly as our habits change, they are nevertheless in process of change. I do not know whether they are relaxing, as peevish spirits maintain, or whether they are better or worse than of old. This alone is certain, that they are no longer quite the same. In cases of passion, as well as in others, the idea of *duty*, from which Corneille, for instance, drew such magnificent effects, has lost part of its rigour, and nothing more is required to modify large sections of literary matter. How, for example, could an inward struggle have the same violence in the minds of husband and wife united by bonds which they consider indissoluble, as it has in the minds of those who know that they can break them by means of some legal manoeuvre, for which they have only to refer to a solicitor and an advocate? Can you expect lovers to judge their passion with the same severity and to struggle against it with the same energy whether they deem it eternally guilty, condemned and perilous to their honour, or, on the contrary susceptible, after some little inconveniences, of receiving all the sanctions of the law and of public opinion? One of the essential "springs" of literary mechanism has been loosened by the more and more widespread idea of the dissolubility of marriage. The trouble is to replace it. And in seeking this, the most original writers have taken to describing not the conflicts of passion with duty, but its struggles with itself, its spontaneous anguish, the tragic fires which it sets alight, and in which it is consumed, and more than ever it is a case of "*Venus tout entière à sa proie attachée.*" In invading these hearts which are detached from all religious or moral faith, and from all "prejudices,"

social or worldly, Venus no longer meets with the barriers which she formerly had to overthrow; she is none the less cruel for that, and finds a thousand new ways of torturing her victims. In this kind of work the *Théâtre d'Amour* by Georges de Porto-Riche is particularly characteristic. In this piece we see persons who are absolutely engrossed by their passion suffering to the point of despair without ever asking themselves whether it is guilty or not, and only because they look to find in it happiness or certainty, peace or exaltation, security with caprice, pleasure with dignity, without attaining to a reconciliation of these contraries. So that in each essential scene and at each issue they are crying out at the everlasting misery of their hearts: "Alas, we have rent one another like two enemies; irreparable words have been said, I have misunderstood you, you have deceived me, and there I am. We might almost believe that we are riveted to one another by all the evil we have done to each other, by all the infamies we have thrown in each other's faces. What a degradation!"* Or, again, that poignant cry of Dominique, in *Le Passé*, when she rejects the advances of her old lover, whom she still loves and who urges her: "Oh my youth, my youth! to have lost it whilst you were not there! To have it no longer when now at last you love me, and I need it so much! Alas! Alas! I would give you my whole life, and I am hardly beautiful enough for a caprice."† If I were to say that there is nothing more human, nothing profounder in *Phèdre* or in *Bajazet*, should I be believed? Yet here passion is the sole subject; it is of that alone that she thinks; no duty confronts her; it is on her own account that she is distressed; she is indeed her own executioner—and the torture is perfect. In pieces like *Le Voleur*, which had a triumph last year, or *Samson*, which is being played with success at this moment, M. Bernstein appears to have pursued with less art and more brutality a parallel path, and I find it rather curious to note the pleasure which the public takes in its cruel studies of passion—pure and simple, if one may say so. They always seem more immoral than those in which the old conflicts were described, even if they end in the most lamentable defeats; it is perhaps because they are really *non-moral*. Spectators and readers of average judgment admit that passion carries it over duty, vice over virtue, and evil over good; but they have more difficulty in consenting simply to obliterate the line of demarcation. "*Entre les deux sentiers dont il ne reste rien.*"‡

I am quite aware that foreign readers make most serious complaint against our writers of this tendency. Shall I undertake their defence? It would lead me too far from the subject I have set myself. Yet

* *Amoureuse* iii. 8.

† *Le Passé*, v. 14.

‡ Musset. "Between the two paths of which nothing remains."

I cannot refrain from reminding readers before I pass on that, as far as I am concerned, I have always maintained that a writer, so long as he is sincere, and does not seek scandals for unnecessary reasons, has an absolute right to represent life just as he sees, observes or conceives it. He does not compel anyone to read his novels, or to listen to his plays. But if the public, who are responsible for the choice of their reading, or of the plays they see, have full liberty to avoid them when they consider them unwholesome, it is important that the writer should preserve his liberty to treat every subject as he understands it, with such reservations only as he thinks he ought to maintain, and of which he must be the judge.

* * *

If it is difficult to discover any clear unity in the ideas, as a whole, which constitute the framework of our literature, it is no easier to discover any such unity in its forms, whether one examines its various classes, its moulds, its phraseology, or its vocabulary.

I said above that history appears to be at this moment the subject preferred by readers. Yet it does not occupy the kind of regal position which tragedy held, for instance, in the seventeenth century; it is a mere preference and no more, a vogue which answers to the long-continued favour of the novel. The novel, indeed, which, with its convenient framework and its intentional laxity, suits so well the literary taste of a democratic age, a taste necessarily somewhat worn, held that regal position for a short period, the period in which the great works of Emile Zola, Alphonse Daudet, and then Guy de Maupassant were appearing. But it has lost it. In spite of the talent displayed by our present novelists, amongst whom there are many besides the few I have had occasion to name who deserve mention—in spite of the fact again that several of them handle their tools admirably and wield them with a splendidly sure hand, and although a very numerous public is no more weary of new editions of famous novels than the publishers are of offering them, yet the novel no longer attracts exclusive attention, it is no longer the most effective means of making one's name, of becoming celebrated, or of spreading one's ideas. The theatre, which fifteen years ago seemed to be falling into decay, has regained its lost ground and found its vein—to apply to it the word which has served as the title of one of its greatest successes and has brought good fortune to Alfred Capus. With its emotions, its expansive power, its seductions, and its enormous profits, the theatre keeps its prestige among authors as well as with the crowd; it has consequently taken from the novel some of its best representatives, such as Paul Hervieu, and one feels that its attractive force is acting on others also. Paul Bourget felt it recently, as is proved by the great success of the play he wrote with a young collaborator, after his novel, *Un divorce*. It is much the same with poetry, which the Naturalists had excommuni-

cated. And there are some narrower literary walks, if one may so speak, the astonishing popularity of which should be noticed. Such, for instance, is the lecture, dear both to the fashionable and to the populace, which for some takes the place of reading and for others provides an intellectual and easily-digested sketch of the topics of discussion or conversation, a way of spending an idle hour, and of seeing one's friends and being seen. Perhaps it partly owes its vogue to the marvellous art displayed by Brunetière in this line. We have no other lecturer to-day to be compared with him for the masterly arrangement of his material, his beauty of style, the solidity of his information and his wonderful authority in speaking; qualities which made his ten lessons on the *Origines de l'Encyclopédie*, delivered in 1905 before the Lecture Society, quite unforgettable and supreme. Those only who heard them can know their full value. But René Doumic, Jules Lemaître and some others still maintain this kind of exercise at a very honourable level. Perhaps the lecture will be the last refuge of oratory, for one cannot say that it has disappeared, though it is in process of transformation. We have not, so far as I know, a sacred orator of equal renown to Lacordaire or Didon; and if Lent sermons still attract a respectable audience, the merit is perhaps not due to the talent of the preachers. On the other hand the young members of the bar, such as Me. Henri Robert, Me. Chenu, Me. Decori and several others, are on the high road to a revival of its models, and the creation of an art which, whilst breaking away from the old traditions of eloquence, is admirably adapted for its object, and gains a position by qualities which are displayed and perfected from day to day, so that a speech made by one of them which has no vestige of resemblance to the famous utterances of Jules Favre or Lachaud is a masterpiece of precision, vigour, faultless clarity and persuasive logic. The same observation applies to political speaking, the changed style of which was ushered in by such men as Waldeck-Rousseau, Clémenceau, Ribot, Poincaré. Though perhaps less clever and less perfected in their art, the Parliamentarians who compel attention tend more and more to bring their method into line with that which succeeds in the Courts.

I should fall too far short of a complete view if I omitted to mention, if only as a reminder, the songs (*chansons*) which are applauded by a certain public (I verily believe foreigners and tourists form the majority of them) in restaurants. They have a picturesqueness of a more or less artificial or highly spiced description; the ancient *Chat Noir*, which was the first and the most successful, has, I think, never been surpassed.

History, the novel, the drama, poetry and oratory have always developed on parallel lines, each having its periods of popularity and of reverse. But the lecture and the song have now taken on an importance which they have never had before.

Are there in form—that is to say in language, style and vocabulary—any general characteristics which tend to prevail. One of the salient facts of the present and preceding periods has been the triumph of *impressionism* in painting. The art critics contributed largely to preparing the way for it. We have not forgotten the sensation caused by the article on “The Salon” of 1866, which Emile Zola wrote in *l'Événement*, and afterwards brought out in a pamphlet in order to explain the formulæ of the young School, to trace its programme, and to defend its master, Edouard Manet, then the subject of much dispute. Forty years have gone by since that manifesto, and the battle has long since been won. The *Olympia* by Manet, which was the centre point of the conflict, is at the Louvre; and no one cares to deny that it is in its right place beside the masterpieces of the French School. The canvases of Paul Cézanne—to whom that very “Salon” of 1866 was dedicated—of Claude Monnet and of others are at a premium in the market, and the impressionist æsthetics more or less inspire every new production. Similarly we have experienced and still possess a literary impressionism, the fortune of which has been less splendid, but whose characteristics somewhat closely resemble those of the impressionist painters. No drawing, very little composition, a great deal of light and movement and colour; tones which clash violently or dissolve boldly; “blots” which fix a rapid impression, often confused and unexplained; personal and fleeting vision preferred to a more considered, attentive and synthetic view; violent effects obtained by surprise; the sentence as it were deprived of backbone, and every effort of art devoted to the wording; among these efforts the adjective in description and the noun in dialogue claiming even greater importance at the expense of the verb. Certain brilliant successes, particularly in the theatre, would incline us to say that this tendency has a greater prevalence than ever; but it will not do to forget that along with these pieces, in which all the interest lies in the clashing of situations or events, and not unfrequently common expressions and incoherent cries take the place of a dialogue reduced to its simplest terms, we have seen others appear whose language and structure are as severe as one could wish, such as those of Georges de Porto-Riche and Paul Hervieu and some of Henri Lavedan’s and the last of Maurice Dounay. No novels have ever been more skilfully constructed than those of Paul Bourget, written in better language than those of René Bazin, carried through with finer art than those of Marcelle Tinayre, or richer in narrative power than those of Marcel Prévost, nor can there be found in all our poetry gems of grander style than some of the pieces of Henri de Régnier, especially in his new book, *La Sandale Ailée*. The contrast between these two tendencies, from which I shall try presently to draw a lesson, is evident enough.

The only trait which they have in common is the taste for enriching their vocabulary; almost all writers love to disinter old-fashioned words, to discover expressive or dainty expressions rarely in use, to make search for exact or highly decorated terms, sometimes even among the provincialisms which used to be so loftily despised. It is in effect a continuation of the movement initiated by the Romantics —perhaps somewhat moderated by good taste and discrimination?

Have I now sufficiently shown what a glance over our contemporary literature permits us to state at the first blush: that there is no predominant school of writers, no common direction, and that the whole of our literary production is above all heterogeneous and composite? Nevertheless one seems sometimes to discern amidst these diverse elements one feature which, though not enough to give it a character of unity, may perhaps serve to guide future critics in disentangling the skein; it is the *desire for truth in painting life and describing feelings*. We can see at once whence comes this disposition, it springs out of the reaction against Romanticism, which, on the contrary, delighted in exaggerating facts, falsifying proportions, over-colouring characters, swelling out passions, and was never satisfied without frenzied rhetoric and word-painting. As has been seen above, it was the chief task of the best writers of the second half of the nineteenth century to get rid of these artifices and expel the virus which poisoned them. They did not always succeed; traces of Romanticism are found in Baudelaire, in the Flaubert of *Salammbô* or the *Visitation de Saint-Antoine*. At the supreme moment of his "Naturalist" campaign, Zola himself lamented that he was still a Romanticist in spite of himself; and as it sometimes happens that we fall back in later years upon the permanent dispositions of our nature which life had for a time effaced, he became more and more Romantic as years went on, so that his latest novels seem quite opposite to the methods he had laid down and the most successful examples of his best period, and recalled somewhat the prophetic style of Victor Hugo's latest manner. Still sacrificing to the idol, these writers had at least denounced the character of their alloy; it was their chief merit and their discovery.

After them others came, who perhaps served the cause better by their collective effort than by any remarkable works. Their personal reputation is undoubtedly less; that is because talent in these days is current and widespread; everyone obtains an honest share, as in the case of a too large class of co-heirs, while no one is so favoured as to attain that kind of "royalty" which Victor Hugo enjoyed for so long, nor even the disputed dictatorship of Zola, who succeeded him as a tribune succeeds to an Emperor.

But in substance, different as they are from each other, Impressionists or Classicists or Realists or "Humanists," or unclassified as they may be, our writers have all in common that love of truth in observation and in expression which is the characteristic and the glory of all their efforts, however incomplete. Take the most artistic among them, say Henri de Régnier: you can see that the exactness of his terms is to his mind inseparable from their beauty. Listen to one of our best plays, open one of our most esteemed novels, you will carry away the same impression: the work may be different in genius, in spontaneity, in power, in abundance; probably it may be so; but at least the author does not try to inflate it in order to put the reader off, in the insufferable manner of the Romanticists, great and small. Take one of the books of history of which I have spoken, or a book of literary history, or even of criticism; the same quality will strike you; you will find the writer going carefully by short steps, resting on his documents as on a pair of crutches, not hunting for effects, but relying for intensity upon the force of the events, he relates rather than upon the more or less brilliant manner in which he relates them.

And this characteristic is really, I think, the only one which I can discover everywhere, or at least of which I can discover all around me recognisable traces, even when it is actually defaced or lost. By its means I can succeed in judging the period I live in. Romanticism was a luxurious and intoxicating vapour bath which interrupted the traditional course of French literature, though it made a splendid sensation and was an interlude by no means to be regretted. After this formidable shock, comparable with that which it suffered in the time of Ronsard, or later on when, with the young Pierre Corneille and the Spaniards, it failed to invent Romanticism two centuries before its time, our literature has returned to its normal route and has pieced its broken threads together again. We are Classicists to our marrow; we had ceased to be so; we are trying to become Classicists again. In that saying I would sum up my opinion on the general tendencies of our literature at the present time; but, if accepted at all, it should not be accepted without taking account of the variety of works and of characters which I have here observed upon, and this reservation will suffice to moderate whatever in my verdict would otherwise be too general or too absolute.

EDOUARD ROD.

MODERN ATTACKS ON CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

IT has long seemed probable that the ethics of Christianity would not be left untouched by the general attack on the Christian creed. With attacks on the supernatural basis and content of that religion we have long been familiar, and it was unreasonable to suppose that the moral standpoint taken up by the Christian Church and founded, as she has always held and taught, upon the life and teaching of Christ Himself and His Apostles would continue unchallenged. For Christianity is one and homogeneous, not a mere collection of departments, religious, metaphysical and ethical, but a vital unity, with its parts so inter-related that one could not be so affected as to leave the others precisely as they were before. Indeed the only ground for surprise has been that those who have repudiated the Christian solution of the problems of existence have yet been willing to accept and even strongly support a morality whose strength and beauty, if it be strong and beautiful, as these assailants of Christian dogma have been ready to confess, must surely be an argument of no slight strength for the truth of Christian teaching when it has dealt with the ultimate questions of metaphysic and theology. Not that in the past no attacks have been made on the moral teaching of the Christian Church: Celsus, whose polemic, entitled "A True Discourse," is the first which we know of as expressly written to confute Christianity, uses arguments in contempt of Christian ethics which remind us not a little here and there of those popularised 1700 years later by Nietzsche; and there are others besides; but these attacks have been spasmodic, and in theory at least there has been no general revolt from the Christian ethical view. But during the last half century there has been a change; powerful writers have arisen who have seen that Christian ethics have no rock-basis apart from Christian dogma, and have accordingly boldly attacked the Christian moral ideal. The object of this paper is to review briefly a few of these "immoralists," as certain of their own prophets triumphantly describe

themselves, to consider the main lines of the attacks they have delivered, estimate their validity, and suggest possible defences on the Christian side which may be able to withstand the shock.

But although the attack has been only what intelligent men might have expected, yet it might have been indefinitely deferred but for one great theory or rather fact of life which revolutionised scientific thought during the last century. The Darwinian theory of evolution came as a revelation in the field of physical science. But at first evolution was rigidly confined to the province in which it appeared; and though Newman's "Essay on the Development of 'Christian Doctrine,'" which appeared some six years earlier than the "Origin of Species," contains parallels with the scientific doctrine in its theory of the gradual evolving of dogma, or rather of the consciousness of the Church with regard to dogma, yet neither ethics nor scientific theology were at first much affected by it. And much later than Darwin, as late as Huxley's Romanes Lecture on Evolution and Ethics, we find one of the greatest Darwinians entirely refusing to allow to evolution the supreme word in ethics, and arguing that the ethical progress of society depends not on imitating the cosmic progress, but on combating it. But the evolutionary theory, though, as we know now, in no sense necessarily anti-Christian or anti-theistic, was, when it burst upon the world, taken to be such, and largely through the fault (natural though perhaps that fault was) of the Christian Church, became materialised and degraded into a rationalistic philosophy. Hence its professors, or rather its most advanced adherents, proceeded logically and inevitably to apply it as a philosophy to every branch of human life and thought, to ethics among the rest. Neither the older intuitive theory nor the older utilitarianism was quite satisfactory, especially as when once God had been denied to a moral universe as its spiritual Centre it was found more and more difficult to discover grounds strong enough to bear the whole weight of a transcendental ethical system.

Besides all this there were more specific causes for an attack on Christian ethics; and again we must admit that if the Christian principle has been misunderstood, it has been due in the first instance to the wrong lines taken by much Christian thought. And certainly the impression constantly received as to the Christian life, the impression that asceticism is of the very essence of the Gospel, has arisen out of the practice of the Church in past ages, and the pre-eminence that is still given to ascetic ideals among millions of Christians to-day. Monasticism is still held by great portions of the Christian Church to be the "Vita religiosa," the true Christian life, while the unascetic life, though sufficient, is yet lower. But we must repeat that asceticism is not the heart of the Gospel. Professor Harnack in his "Das Wesen des Christenthums" has pointed out

that neither the life of Christ as portrayed in the Gospels, nor the fundamental thoughts of His message, nor the impressions which the disciples received as to their Lord, are consistent with the ascetic hypothesis; but where there has been so much misunderstanding within the Church itself, it is hardly a matter for surprise that opponents of Christian theology have seized gladly, though not dishonestly, upon this apparent irreconcilability between the ideals of Christianity and the practical life of almost the whole modern world. And again it has been thought, with some justification in this case too, that the Christian ideal of conduct is a weak and effeminate one, lacking the manlier and more courageous virtues, so that even the Christ of the Gospels, whose courage and severity, when severity was needed, are as well marked as His compassion and tenderness, has been transformed into a weak and unpractical dreamer.

So far it is true that Christian ethics have been misunderstood and disparaged in consequence; but it is not any misunderstanding of the Christian ideal which has provoked the outburst in favour of a different ethical principle. The cleavage is far too complete for such an explanation to stand. It is the ideal itself which has aroused the anger of its foes; and by setting out some of the points of that ideal which have been most violently assailed we shall be able to see the lines of the battle more clearly.

First of all its valuations are attacked. Christianity does say quite definitely that physical strength, intellectual brilliance and worldly success are not the most important things, even that they are relatively of no importance at all. Christianity, not Nietzsche, is the real transvaluer of all values. Nietzsche's values are natural, perhaps a little less than natural, whereas Christianity's are supernatural. And rising out of this comes Christianity's characteristic, and in the mouth of her enemies Christianity's reproach, of other-worldliness, represented by Nietzsche as the negation of life and treason to the present world. We may freely admit that in certain ages, perhaps even to-day in some cases, the Church has concentrated her attention too much on the world beyond the grave and thought of that and that alone as Life Eternal, to the neglect of the common duties of everyday life here; we may admit that we no longer think that there is such a cleavage between life here and life hereafter as was once imagined; but for all that, given the postulate of immortality, the belief that this life is more of a preparation than of a fulfilment, that it leads on to reality but is not reality itself, is a sound one. There is a sense in which the Christian may claim the pagan and neo-pagan conceptions of self-expression and self-realisation for his own use, but at the same time he must allow that if mere individualistic self-realisation here and now is the end of man, then Christianity has been at fault. For the Christian the

perfect expression of the self is not to be found here, or if he finds it it will only be through self-sacrifice. Self-sacrifice is the Christian principle, just as the most perfect development of a man's whole nature was that of the Greeks. The Greeks in their prime are the supreme historical instance of a people dominated by what we should now call the artistic temperament, which claims the right to grow by a deliberate intent to try every kind of experience. This, of course, does not imply that the artistic temperament is necessarily immoral or even non-moral; but its ideals, especially as worked out in history, are not the same as the Christian ideals, and may very seriously conflict with them. And no Christian, however much he may value beauty and art and accomplishment in all the walks of life, would deny that all these things must if it be found necessary, as ever since the Gospel was preached it has in many cases been found necessary, be sacrificed for the pearl of great price, the Kingdom of God.

There is one matter in particular where opposition to Christian morality has been especially acute,—the matter of the relations of the sexes. So far I have spoken of objections raised mainly against the Christian spirit and the Christian attitude; but here, though the objections to the spirit and attitude still remain, they are reinforced by the objection to Christian law. Christianity is not a legalistic religion, but it has and must have its own rules, and in this province it asserts its rules convincingly. An eminent theologian has given it as his opinion that this is the one province in which Christ Himself definitely legislated, and certainly to-day it is the province where the Church is most jealously vigilant, and also where the attacks of her opponents are beginning to be most keenly directed. The Church asserts that in her ideal for marriage she is supported not only by the words of her Founder, but also by the experience of past history and by the results whenever no such ideal has existed. To-day this position is challenged all along the line; we shall have to look at it a little closer when we come to consider Bernard Shaw's criticism of the Christian standpoint in this matter.

And lastly,—to bring to a close this investigation of some of the causes which alienate certain modern thinkers from Christian morality,—the Christian ideal is assailed as being entirely impracticable. National Christianity, it has been said, is impossible without a nation of Christs. It might have been added that individual Christianity is impossible except so far as the individual is morally a potential Christ, if it is possible now to get that phrase back into its proper setting and away from the nebulous metaphysic of the City Temple. But it is obvious that the phrase above quoted is, as it stands, a truism, while if it is intended to prove the impossibility of a national Christianity it is a *petitio principii*.

As a result then of our investigations, we find that the kind of

conception of Christianity, as embodying a particular ethic, current among its denouncers is somewhat as follows:

Christianity arose in the East, the home of asceticism, through the preaching of Jesus Christ, who, in the face of a world controlled by the sheer might of the Roman Empire, proclaimed that strength and power were not the most important qualities in a man, not those most favoured by God, but that it was the humble-minded, the poor in spirit, the gentle and submissive who was truly son of God. By this transvaluation the first blow was struck at the power of the ancient world and its culture. The creed of Jesus was taken over and enforced by Paul, who fixed it still more clearly on other worldly lines, on which it continued owing to the Church's struggle against the superior physical strength of the State, which left Christians but little to hope for in this world. The world and the flesh were given wholly over to the Devil; culture was repudiated, and an ideal substituted such as was natural to the poor, the oppressed and the slaves, among whom Christianity especially flourished. The doctrine of the equality of all men in the sight of God, and the supreme importance of the pre-eminently Christian virtues, especially the virtue of humility, which made an immense difference between the otherwise somewhat similar Christian and Stoic principles, was Christianity's rejoinder to the obvious fact that while it was fighting for its life, all the wealth, the power, the art, the culture, and almost all the intellect of the Empire, was arrayed against it. Hence it is apparent that the Christian ethical system was determined on thoroughly non-natural grounds, that it developed an inevitable and violent antagonism to the environment in which it found itself, and relied largely on its threat of hell to all who stood outside it. And now, in opposition to all this and especially to Christian views as to marriage and the procreation of children, it is necessary, we are told, to realise that man is first of all an animal, and his first duty is to be a strong and healthy animal, and that after this his ideal must be self-expression and not self-repression, self-culture and not self-sacrifice, a self-found law (or an absence of law—they mean the same) and not the imposition of a law upon him from without.

I now wish to examine some modern criticisms of Christian ethics in rather more detail; and I will begin with him who is unquestionably the most famous, and some would say the ablest—Friedrich Nietzsche.

Nietzsche has one great principle which lies at the root of his whole outlook upon life and of his whole opposition to Christianity; it is this, that the physiological standard, the physiological test must be supreme, that civilisation starts, as the ancient Greeks believed it to start, with the body. Now the salient fact about the body is its instincts, and bodily happiness consists in the satisfying of the bodily instincts. Here then is the mark of what Nietzsche calls the

ascending life—that happiness is identical with instinct; when once a man finds that he has to combat his instincts he may know that he has entered upon the first phase of decadence. And Christianity is the supreme instance of decadence, because its attitude is one of negation and opposition. It has invented the criteria “good and evil,” whereas the only true criteria are “good and bad,” which judge of all things by their survival value and not by the importation of such mythical concepts as the “good and evil” of Christianity are.

Does Nietzsche then repudiate the whole conception of morality? By no means; morality for him, true morality, is not merely unending but in its principles never changing. Morals started from men's feelings of superiority and nobility, and are above everything else the will to life and therefore the will to power. Strength always must manifest itself as strength, and therefore this morality is shown by the greater strength and vitality possessed by its professors. And this morality is summed up by Nietzsche in a word as “Master-morality.”

Opposed to this master-morality stands slave-morality, in which Christianity is rooted. And it is so called because it is the morality proper to and proceeding from those who being less fit to survive have invented it in order to check the action of natural selection, and to maintain themselves against their proper masters. Then since the slaves are not only more numerous than their masters, but also have more cunning they prevail over the stronger. The feeling at the bottom of this uprising of the inferior elements in the community is essentially revenge, though it is cloaked by them with the name of justice and they represent it as the victory of God over evil men, just as when they were in a state of subjection they made a virtue of necessity and canonised their cowardice. St. Paul is the very apostle of this cult of revenge for Nietzsche; he indeed shares with Immanuel Kant the distinction of being more hated by Nietzsche than any other historical character. His conversion is not admitted even to be an hallucination, but is roundly declared to be a lie, which he needed in order that he might tyrannise over the mass of the people. But the Christian principle of brotherhood and charity is not merely contaminated in its source and origin, it is in itself slavish and decadent. Noble natures always see something contemptible in sympathy, pity and brotherly love, and all altruistic morality is a sure mark of degeneracy; even Herbert Spencer is classed as a decadent because of his altruistic tendencies. And altruism is bad because it is opposed to life. The altruist does not merely say “I am of no account,” but further “Life is of no account,” and so altruism, like God and the other world, is merely a negation, a repudiation of the will to power.

We see the same kind of tendency at work when we glance at Nietzsche's metaphysic, or rather at his reason for having no genuine

metaphysic at all. For metaphysic is concerned with ultimate reality, with the things that are as opposed to the things that become. Just as the ethical idealist is not content till he has discovered an eternal principle at the back of morality, so the transcendentalist or Hegelian looks beyond phenomena in the hope of catching sight for a moment of the thing in itself. Kant's theory is particularly repulsive to Nietzsche, for not content with looking for the thing in itself, he attached to that his conception of the categorical imperative, and so framed his thought of a real world which should have morality as its basis. Nietzsche is a pure phenomenalist; and the only philosopher whom he eyes with any favour is Heraclitus whose creed was that nothing is, but everything is becoming. So Nietzsche's theory of knowledge, if it can be called such, prevents him from the least attempt to get beyond phenomena. Further, all such concepts as soul, will, responsibility, are contemptuously brushed aside by him as mere non-existences. "We know," he says, "that there is no such thing as soul or will. We cannot speak of the will, the motive or the ego as causes: there are no spiritual causes at all." The influence of music, for instance, is purely physiological. And so, returning through his metaphysic to his morality, we discover with no great surprise that he has no place for any responsibility, no place for any goal of human effort. We are necessary, we belong to the whole and exist in the whole, and outside the whole there is nothing, so that nothing can judge or condemn us, for that would be to judge or condemn the whole to which we belong. Sin is a figment: it was invented by priests to serve their own ends.

The Christian virtues, then, are for him merely the products of lack of power, and are the opposite of the manly virtues and of real freedom, the will to be responsible for one's own self, which is the apotheosis of all manly instincts. Yet here we meet with one of his occasional really fine thoughts, that freedom is worth just what it costs us. Freedom is the will to bear, and to the sacrifice of all persons, even one's self, for one's cause, to be able to rise even above the instincts of happiness. "The man who has become free," he writes, "treads under foot the contemptible species of well-being dreamt of by shopkeepers, Christians, cows, women, Englishmen and other democrats."

We see in Nietzsche a frank, terrible, but not wholly ignoble individualism carried almost to its logical extreme. Not quite, however; for despite his physiological test and his praise of the Greek gods because in them the animal in man felt deified, sensualism is not really a prominent factor in his writings. Despite, moreover, of his contempt for Carlyle, as a rhetorician who mistook indigestion for the moral appeal of his conscience, there is even in Nietzsche a certain divine discontent with the world and with humanity; otherwise he would not have looked forward to the coming

of the Superman, that great power that can only come through the sacrifice of lesser powers. But more will have to be said on that subject lower down.

It is a little difficult to appreciate Nietzsche fairly. He keeps up a continual scream when he is dealing with things he does not like, and it is natural to ask whether Christian morality is in any real danger from such excessive violence, especially as his defects are obvious. They include an utterly unsatisfactory metaphysic, and an extraordinary lack of historical insight and genuine critical ability. Nothing could well be more fantastic than his theory that slave-morality was a device invented by the unfit to safeguard themselves against the ordinary processes of natural selection.

His attitude towards the Founder of Christianity is more favourable than might have been expected; but it is only so because he totally misunderstands Christ's whole life and message. Christ, according to him, inaugurated an actual happiness here on earth, which was the Gospel and which died with Him. It was Paul who transformed the message of Jesus, imagining a gulf between God and man such as Jesus never imagined. It was Paul who by his doctrine of resurrection filched away the whole concept of blessedness, the entire and sole reality of the Gospel, in favour of a state after death. And whereas Jesus lived and died to show men how to live, loving men all the while, Paul was merely actuated by the basest motives of revenge, perpetuated in a Church which exists for the wickedest of all purposes—to depreciate human nature, though it and its priests have lost all faith in the very elements of its creed, and its members' practice is invariably anti-Christian.

I pass on from Nietzsche to Bernard Shaw, an assailant of a different and I think a higher type. Both men are thoroughly honest and care about truth, but Bernard Shaw is also moved by a deep hatred of cruelty and a genuine love of his fellow men and a wish to improve them all, which is totally lacking in Nietzsche.

His chief objection to Christian morality and the civilisation founded upon it is simply this, that it has not made mankind better, and now stands in the path of the one thing that will make mankind better—namely the scientific production of the Superman. You will find nothing much more completely pessimistic as to man's possibilities of moving upwards, so long as human nature remains what it is now, than the "Revolutionist's Handbook" at the end of "Man and Superman." The point already attained by civilisation marks the extreme of possibility, and even from that man continually falls away, while its apprehension when it is apprehended is only the privilege of a few. Bernard Shaw, like the Christian, believes the salvation of the world to be essential, but Christianity will not save it; it is impracticable for the ordinary man, and the ordinary man, who especially needs saving, does not vary from generation to generation; there is no progress.

What then is the remedy? The production of the Superman, who, like Nietzsche's Anti-Christ, is to save the world. But there is a great difference between Nietzsche and Shaw in their ideals. Nietzsche is an aristocrat, believing in the physiological causes as the great moving causes which divide men; Shaw is a Socialist, anxious to raise all men to a higher ethical standard, to make them all Supermen. But when it comes to practical action it is through physiological action that Shaw hopes to raise the world, and in his wished-for physiological experimenting he comes to oppose the Christian Church on the moral ground which she considers particularly sacred, on the question of the relation of the sexes and the problem of morality in the narrower sense of the word. And the difference between the Christian Church and Mr. Shaw is this, that Christianity, when face to face with the moral ruin of the old world, took the matter of purity, of marriage, and of what is now known as the problem of sex as one of its most urgent interests, asserted the vital connection of sex and religion, and laid down certain principles and rules which it held *sacrosanct*, whereas Bernard Shaw and the modern school of which he is an illustrious member proclaim, with Ibsen, that the golden rule is that there are no rules, and desire to treat the whole question from a purely scientific standpoint, asserting that religion is as much out of its province when it dogmatises on sex relations as it was when it dogmatised about astronomy.

Bernard Shaw's desire then is that the Superman should be evolved by a careful selection of his parents, under the superintendence if possible of the State, which is vitally interested in having its citizens as strong and healthy as possible. "The socialisation of "the selective breeding of man," to use his own phrase, is the ideal to be aimed at.

In this theory we have a complete setting aside of the whole Christian view of the problem centering round marriage. Christianity has always been at pains to point out to man that for all his animal nature, the "flesh" as it is generally called in the New Testament, yet he must never look upon himself as in the first place an animal. It has invaded the very centre of his animal nature by its consecration of marriage, so that the majority of Christians consider it to be a Sacrament and therefore mystical. It has bound man and woman together for all the circumstances of their lives, making a unity out of a dualism. For good or for evil it has refused to divorce conjugation from domesticity. It denounces in the most unmistakable terms the idea that the State may arrange as it likes for the continuation of the race and may totally sever this necessity from the institution of marriage. For this is what Mr. Shaw wishes to do; he wishes marriage to be looked on merely as a convenient and pleasant manner of life for the two parties, for them to deal with as they like, but that it should be understood that the problem of

the perpetuation of the race is one of the State's most serious businesses, which cannot be left merely to the unregulated impulses of ordinary citizens. Love, as it is usually understood, is kept quite apart from this most serious question of all—the question of the perpetuation of the race. And so we come to the solution of our human ills—that two people carefully chosen for their physical qualities, not necessarily having the very slightest affection for one another, should agree to assist the State by combining to produce the Superman, so that by this method all mankind may eventually be transformed into Superhumanity. The world is to be saved by treating men and women as breeders treat cattle.

Now what does all this mean? For Mr. Shaw is in no sense of the word a sensualist or approaching thereto, and yet his methods must appear degrading in the extreme to those who believe that Christianity has something to say on this problem and that it differs considerably from Mr. Shaw. We are fortunate enough to have the explanation in the last sentence of the "Revolutionist's Handbook," to which I have already referred. There we are told that the men and women prepared to deal with the subject in this way will be those who, no longer believing that they can live for ever, are seeking for some immortal work into which they can throw the best of themselves—the immortal work being, of course, the production of the Superman. In fact when once man is believed to be one of the beasts that perish, it is seriously suggested that he should be willing to conform his practice and methods so nearly to those that are applied in the case of the beasts that the higher and nobler man—the Superman—may result. And men will have to decide whether in these problems there are any generalisations that can be made, any ideals that may be pursued,—as the Christian Church has always made generalisations and set before men her ideals, though conscious that her generalisations may act hardly in particular cases and her ideals be difficult of apprehension,—or whether with Ibsen and Bernard Shaw they will treat all ideals in these matters as harmful, and refuse to see more than a scientific problem to be solved like any other such problem, or a passion to be gratified without regard to the laws of a religion or the sanctities of a marriage-bond. We find the extreme logical conclusion of these non-Christian views on the sex problems in Mr. John Davidson's recent poem, "The Triumph of Mammon." The whole meaning of a particularly savage attack upon Christian morality is that Christianity is a foe to the present gratification of the senses; and it can hardly be unfair to the author to say that questions as to the legitimacy of such gratification never enter his head, seeing that the hero is made to kill his father and brother that he may ~~be~~ in a position to gratify his desire for pleasure, and his action is unquestionably rather commended than condemned. Mr. Davidson has no

need for the Superman, in fact he rather distrusts him; the Superman might develop a kind of Christian moral sense. His quarrel with Christianity is not that it is not saving the world, but that it interferes with people's appetites. Therefore he is no scientific breeder of a new race, but an apologist for the most unchartered freedom for the individuals of the old one.

The last champion of non-Christian ideals in ethics of whom I wish to say a word is Mr. Lowes Dickinson. Mr. Dickinson has the merit of being at once subtler and much more courteous than Nietzsche, Mr. Shaw or Mr. Davidson. He freely recognises the good Christianity has done; he agrees with it in its democratic insistence that the moral ideal must be for all. Only unfortunately the ideal is impracticable for ordinary people, who consequently merely explain it away and then delude themselves into the belief that they are Christians. But there is another ideal, one that has been tried and, Mr. Dickinson would I suppose say, succeeded, though it contributed not a little to the ruin of the race which tried it. He would have us return to the ideals of Greek culture, of Greek individualistic self-realisation. He is careful to point out that the Greeks were not at all mere materialists; on the contrary, the whole attention which they paid to personal beauty, to the training of the body for athletic distinction, and to the great works of art, was for the sake of the soul or spirit behind, the beautiful soul symbolised by the beautiful body. It is the artistic conception of ideal good, and though Nietzsche declares that no Christian can be an artist because an artist's work is positive, yet it is not in itself anti-Christian and may be noble and spiritual. But when we are asked to depose Christian ethics and return to the worship of Greek culture we can only point to the fate of the ancient world, to the viciousness that was interwoven through and through with its ideal, and to its profound pessimism. The Greek ideal was a noble one, but it had in it those seeds of destruction through which it ultimately perished. Mr. Dickinson contrasts it with ecclesiasticism; but ecclesiasticism, whether Catholic or Protestant, is not the same as Christianity, and the supreme triumph of Christianity is its substantiated claim to deal effectively with the personal moral problem, often the personal moral disaster, which is the most crucial fact in man's nature. And so long as men feel the need of a real ethical redemption and not a mere artistic self-sufficiency they will prefer Christianity to Hellenism.

Now let us look once again on these various objections to Christian ethics. We have seen that all the objectors concentrate on what they consider to be the mutilating, repressive attitude of Christianity. They all of them are rooted in the view that man is for this world alone, that he is a creature of a day. They all of them thoroughly partake of the old Epicurean spirit, "Let us eat and

"drink for to-morrow we die." The eating and drinking may be as entirely sensual as Mr. Davidson makes it, or as refined and in a sense elevating as it is in Mr. Lowes Dickinson's pages, but in the end it is the same—the self-sufficiency, however interpreted, of a creature bounded entirely by birth and death. Nietzsche indeed frankly asserts his Epicureanism, and makes the bold statement that every respectable man in the Roman Empire was an Epicurean, a change; if true, from the days when Cicero wrote, "All the most respectable men despise the Epicureans."

This paper is concerned with a statement of the positions that distinguished men of our times have come to in their attacks on Christian morals, and is not primarily an apologetic. Yet I should like to end by suggesting certain possible lines of defence. And first of all, the Christian, disputing the basis on which the anti-Christian attack has been reared, asserts that man is immortal in his nature, and that both in this respect and in others, as we find him, he is essentially different from the lower animals, so that his difference from them is much more remarkable than his resemblance to them. Further, he will affirm that it is the soul or spirit, and not the body, which furnishes man with his regulative principle; and if it is retorted that we know nothing of the soul and cannot even prove its existence, he will confess that the word "soul" may be a symbol, but it is a symbol which counts, for it indicates a hidden reality.

Then coming to treat of the various other ideals set up, the Christian apologist will point out that Nietzsche and Davidson confessedly combat the advance of man in his progress further away from primitive things. Nietzsche asserts that the noble races are essentially barbarian in instinct, as is shown by their quickness of feeling and absence of revenge and spitefulness. And though Nietzsche's Superman may get beyond mercy and pity, there is nothing to show that Nietzsche intended him to get beyond some of the most primitive instincts of savage peoples. Davidson in his glorification of man's passion finds the true antitype of all love in the purely mechanical action of the ether, and the coming together therein of light and sound. Bernard Shaw gives up humanity as hopeless until the Superman is produced, and therefore has for his ideal the transformation of humanity into something else; while Mr. Lowes Dickinson presents an ideal which nearly ruined the world once, which Plato and Aristotle both found it necessary to contend against in their respective ways—a fact grasped by Nietzsche, who accordingly adorns the greatest of Greek thinkers with his favourite name of "decadents"—and which ended, as Mr. Chesterton has pointed out, in Christianity once and would probably end in it again.

But if we leave these inadequate solutions we shall, I think, find that along the lines of Christian ethics the truest progress has been made and will be made. Despite all the evils of our time, we have

advanced far beyond the ancients in our civilisation. There is nothing now which can fairly be compared to the gigantic evil of slavery; there was no power among men then inducing them to co-operate as men co-operate to-day. For Christianity has grasped one great fact in its ethics, and it is that a purely individualistic morality is not adequate, that men are not impenetrable atoms, but that the welfare of each man is bound up with that of his fellows. Despite all the restrictions often put upon an individual's action in the ancient world, yet in the development of the individual life each man stood alone. And if the answer comes that Shaw and even Nietzsche put before us the Abstraction of the Race, and the Generations to come, we reply that such an abstraction has no compelling value, that men will legitimately ask why they should care about a future and somewhat unintelligible Superman, or why they should follow Nietzsche in his declaration that the lesser powers must be sacrificed for the production of a greater power or man. There is no coherence about these ideals, no centre from which there can come the supply of force necessary if these ideals are to be realised.

For if a Superman be really needed, Christianity has long insisted on the need for one, or rather for many, for a world of Supermen. It has been accustomed to speak of them as the regenerate, and has taught that they can be produced from our present human nature, if the moral lever be present, so that there is no need of the production of a new and for us inconceivable thing, a physiological Superhumanity. And the strength of Christianity is not merely that it sets the ideal before men, but that it has that in it which can enable them to the ideal's realisation.

J. KENNETH MOZLEY.

LORD CROMER AND GOVERNMENT BY JOURNALISM.

TWENTY-THREE years ago it was my privilege to publish in the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW two articles, entitled: "Government by Journalism." At the time those articles were written, two instances of such "government" were fresh in the public mind. One was the despatch of Gordon to the Soudan, the other was the beginning of the re-building of the British Navy. Both enterprises were directly due to the initiative of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of which journal I was at that time the political director. The wisdom of the former act has now been challenged, and as a corollary, conclusions adverse to "government by journalism" have been drawn, by no less a person than Lord Cromer. He devotes nearly 200 pages of his book on "Modern Egypt" to a vindication of his own policy, which of necessity takes the form of an elaborate and plausible attempt to demonstrate the unwisdom of the course taken by the British Press on that occasion.

Lord Cromer asks the question: "Who was responsible for sending 'General Gordon?'" He answers his question as follows:—

In a sense the main responsibility rests with the Press of England, and notably with the *Pall Mall Gazette*. The People of England, as represented by the Press, insisted on sending General Gordon to the Soudan, and accordingly to the Soudan he was sent. "Anonymous authorship," one of the wisest political thinkers of modern times has said "places the Public under the direction of guides who have no 'sense of personal responsibility.'" The arguments in favour of newspaper influence are too commonplace to require mention; but newspaper government has certain disadvantages, and these disadvantages were never more clearly shown than in the incident now under discussion. ("Modern Egypt," vol. I. p. 435.)

The quotation from Sir G. Cornwall Lewis, contained in the above paragraph, may be dismissed as obviously inapplicable to the case in question. No minister, diplomat, or statesman of our time had ever a keener sense of personal responsibility than had those who at that

juncture directed the policy of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. To begin with, the anonymity was very thin, and in the next place, the sense of responsibility of the editor was in no way impaired because he did not sign his name at the foot of his articles.

Lord Cromer implies, although he does not venture to assert, that everything would have gone well, or at any rate nothing would have gone so badly as it did, if the British Press had abstained altogether from interference in the affairs of the Soudan. I do not merely imply, but I unhesitatingly assert, that the only redeeming feature in the whole dreary narrative of the ruin of the Soudan, was supplied by the action of the British Press in sending out General Gordon. The issue, therefore, is fairly joined between us.

We are fortunate in the fact that the questions at issue lie within very small compass. Lord Cromer became British Agent and Consul-General at Cairo on the 11th of September, 1884. On the 21st of April, 1885, Lord Cromer left Egypt on a visit to England, at which time the success of General Gordon's mission had been admittedly impossible for a month, ever since the tribes had risen between Berber and Khartoum, and the only question that then remained to be settled was whether or not he was to be left to perish at his post, or whether any attempt was to be made, by means of a relief expedition, to extricate him from the Soudan. The issue may even be narrowed still further. The news of the destruction of General Hicks's army did not reach Cairo until the 22nd of November, and General Gordon was cut off by the rising of the tribes by the 14th of March. The whole drama was, therefore, confined between those two dates—the 22nd of November and the 14th of March, a period of less than four months, a tragic four months indeed, in which events moved rapidly, and in which the only hope of success lay in instant action, vigorous initiative, and a resolute and consistent policy. But there was neither instant action, vigorous initiative, nor a resolute and consistent policy. It is possible that even if all those qualities had been possessed by Lord Cromer, the end might still have been failure; but the lack of all those qualities rendered success absolutely impossible. The question, therefore, at issue between Lord Cromer and the Press, is: who was responsible for the absence of those prerequisites of success?

I will begin at the beginning, and contrast the policy of the Press and the policy of Lord Cromer, step by step, from the 22nd of November to the 18th of March. I shall have no difficulty in proving that on every critical occasion, Lord Cromer himself being judge, the Press was right, and he was wrong; that it was the Press which possessed prescience, initiative, resolution and energy, and that it was he who was vacillating, procrastinating, and always too late.

FIRST PERIOD, DRIFT AND DAWDLE, NOV. 22ND TO JAN. 8TH.

Let us begin at the beginning. The fatal news arrived at Cairo and London on the 22nd of November. What did Lord Cromer do? He had been two months at his post. During those two months he does not appear to have taken any steps to secure independent and trustworthy information as to the condition of the Soudan, or as to the risks that would have to be faced if General Hicks came to grief. On November 22nd he learned that Hicks's entire force had been destroyed, and that he was therefore face to face with a catastrophe of much greater magnitude than anyone had ventured to anticipate. The occasion was, therefore, one on which instant action was necessary. Lord Cromer had his instructions as to the advice he should give if he were consulted, but what did he do? He tells us (Vol. I. p. 375): "I did not at once press any advice on the Egyptian Government." He wanted more information. The military authorities wanted to study the facts which they ought, under his direction, to have been studying for the last two months, "and in the third place, "I wish to give the Egyptian Government time, in order to see whether they will be able to devise any practical policy of their own." That is what Lord Cromer did.

What the *Pall Mall Gazette* did was to publish a series of interviews, backed up by leading articles of the most strenuous nature, warning the Government as to the immensity of the danger which was confronting them, insisting that a definite policy should be adopted, and that the Government should immediately recognise its responsibility and act accordingly.

That the Government *was* responsible Lord Cromer himself admits. Speaking at an earlier stage of the lamentable business, he says:—

Lord Granville appears to have thought that he did effectually throw off all responsibility by declaring that he was not responsible. There could not have been a greater error. The responsibility of the British Government for the general conduct of affairs in Egypt did not depend upon a few phrases thrown into a despatch and subsequently published in a Parliamentary paper. It was based on the facts that the British Government were in military occupation of the country, that the weakness and inefficiency of the native rulers were notorious, and that the civilised world fixed on England a responsibility which it was impossible to shake off so long as the occupation lasted. "Those," Lord Salisbury said in the House of Lords (Feb. 12, 1884), "who have absolute power of preventing lamentable events and, knowing what is taking place, refuse to exercise that power, are responsible for what happens." Lord Granville failed to see this. (Vol. I. p. 367.)

It is all very well for Lord Cromer to throw the responsibility upon Lord Granville, but he himself tells us that the real man who was responsible was Lord Cromer. He says:—

From the 22nd of November it would be false modesty not to recognise that from this time forward I was myself one of the principal actors on the Egyptian stage, not of course to the extent of being responsible for the general policy of the British Government, but rather to the extent of being mainly responsible for the management of local affairs in Egypt. This latter responsibility I accept, only begging that it should be borne in mind that my action had of necessity to conform itself to the lines of general policy adopted in London. (P. 371.)

Now here we come to the first sharp issue between Lord Cromer and the Press.

The following passage, written by Lord Cromer himself, lays down the standard by which the merits or demerits of the two parties must be tried. Lord Cromer says:—

It may, however, be urged in defence of the policy adopted by Lord Granville, that he does not appear to have received sufficient warning of the possible and indeed probable consequences of inaction. What was most of all required was that an alarm-bell should be rung to rouse the British public from its lethargy, and show that the consequences of inaction might be more serious than those of action. (P. 367.)

It is here declared, by Lord Cromer, that what was "most of all required" was the vigorous ringing of an alarm bell. Who was it that rang the alarm-bell most vigorously, immediately after the news of the destruction of Hicks's army? The material for answering this question is fortunately accessible, and its authenticity is indisputable. We have Lord Cromer's despatches to the British Government on the one side, and the files of the *Pall Mall Gazette* on the other, and I have no hesitation in appealing to Lord Cromer himself, as judge in his own case. Let him compare these two sets of documents, his own despatches, and the leaders and interviews in the *Pall Mall Gazette* in the last week in November and say which rang the alarm-bell most loud. I published an interview with Ismail Pasha, and articles by Sir Samuel Baker, Mr. A. M. Broadley, and others, the gist of all of which was summed up in the last sentences of Sir Samuel Baker's article, which appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette* on the 22nd of November. It runs thus:—

Not an hour should be lost in deciding upon the plan of operations, which should be under the control of only one responsible individual, who should be unfettered in his action. That person should be an Englishman.

Day after day the *Pall Mall Gazette* thundered against the Government for its reluctance to act, and act at once, and warned it, in the most unmistakable terms, of the necessity of instant action if the whole of the Soudan were not to be in a blaze, and the safety of Egypt itself imperilled.

During these fateful moments what was Lord Cromer doing? He

was studying the question and busying himself about other things, but doing nothing to save the garrisons in the Soudan! On the 1st of December he received a telegram from Lord Granville. Roused to action by the vigorous ringing of the alarm-bell of the British Press, Lord Granville suggested to Lord Cromer the appointment of General Gordon. The telegram ran as follows:—

If General Gordon were willing to go to Egypt, could he be of any use to you, or to the Egyptian Government; and if so, in what capacity?

Lord Cromer tells us that his first impression was decidedly adverse to General Gordon's employment in the Soudan. His "objections" were in some degree based on General Gordon's personal unfitness "to undertake the work in hand;" but he tells us that he preferred to shelter himself behind the objections of Cherif Pasha, who was "averse to employing General Gordon, mainly on the ground that the movement in the Soudan being religious, the appointment of a Christian in high command would probably alienate the tribes who remained faithful." He "thought it wise not to press them on the subject." (P. 424.)

Did Lord Cromer, having thus vetoed General Gordon's appointment, propound any alternative policy of his own? The situation was critical. On November 26th Colonel Coetlogon telegraphed from Khartoum:—

To save what remains of the army in the Soudan a retreat on Berber should be made at once, and by a combined movement on Berber and Suakin that route should be opened. The only way of saving what remains is to attempt a general retreat on Berber.

Not till a week after receiving this telegram did Lord Cromer telegraph to Lord Granville that he concurred in the views of his military advisers, that Khartoum could not be held and that an endeavour should be made to open out the Berber-Suakin route, because that would afford the best hope of retreat to the garrisons of Khartoum and the immediate neighbourhood. He added that these views were very unpalatable to the Egyptian Government, and that neither Cherif nor his colleagues could make up their minds to abandon Khartoum.

Did Lord Cromer even then take any definite action to over-ride the irresponsible and incompetent Cherif Pasha, and assert the responsibility which rested full and undivided in the hands of himself and the Government he represented? No such thing. All the while the alarm-bell was kept ringing in the Press at home he was waiting to see what Cherif would do. Not until one week later, nineteen days after the arrival of the news of Hicks's defeat, could he rouse himself to warn Lord Granville that

More definite instructions must shortly be sent as to the attitude

of Her Majesty's Government and as to the advice to be given to the Egyptian Government. At present they are drifting on without any very definite or practical plan of action, and will continue to do so unless they are told what course to pursue. (P. 379.)

This was quite true. They had been drifting on, and Lord Cromer had been drifting with them, and he continued to drift for another ten days. Not until the 22nd of December could he make up his mind to recognise what had been plainly asserted in Northumberland Street a month before, namely, that the time had come for the British Government to make up its mind as to what policy should be pursued in the Soudan, and to insist upon its being carried out. That was on the 22nd of December. The Christmas holidays intervened, and it was not until the 4th of January that he received instructions to insist upon the abandonment of the Soudan. It was not until the night of January the 7th that the Khedive accepted the resignation of Cherif and appointed Nubar Pasha, who accepted cordially the policy of abandoning the Soudan.

So ends the first act of this great tragedy. During the whole period we see the Press, instant, urgent, imperious, ringing the alarm-bell day after day, with vehemence and even violence, to rouse an apathetic Government to instant action, and under the influence of the alarm-bell of the Press we see Lord Granville suggesting the appointment of the one man in all England competent to do what had to be done. We see, on the other hand, at Cairo, dawdling indecision and procrastination, a veto placed upon the appointment of the one supremely able man who could have coped with the situation, and only at long last, when six precious weeks had been wasted, was a definite decision arrived at to adopt the policy of abandonment without any preparations being made to render the execution of that policy possible.

SECOND PERIOD, GORDON'S APPOINTMENT, JAN. 8TH—18TH.

The curtain now rises upon the second act, in which the two opposing forces come into still sharper collision. On the 7th of January, when Cherif resigned and the appointment of Nubar Pasha made Lord Cromer practically dictator of Egypt and the Soudan, Colonel Coetlogon telegraphed, again strongly urging the great necessity for an immediate order for a retreat from Khartoum being given. Consul Power had telegraphed from the same city a week before, saying: "The state of affairs here is very desperate."

It so happened that the day before Lord Cromer telegraphed to Lord Granville, announcing the appointment of Nubar Pasha for the purpose of abandoning the Soudan, General Gordon arrived in England from Brussels. On the following day I interviewed him in Southampton, and obtained from his own lips a clear and comprehen-

sive survey of the situation, which I published next day, with an article entitled: "Chinese Gordon for the Soudan." I wrote:—

We cannot send a regiment to Khartoum; but we can send a man who on more than one occasion has proved himself of more value in similar circumstances than an entire army. Why not send Chinese Gordon with full powers to Khartoum to assume absolute control of the territory and to treat with the Mahdi? There is no necessity to speak of the pre-eminent qualifications which he possesses for the work. No one can deny the urgent need in the midst of that hideous welter of confusion for the presence of such a man, with a born genius for command and an unexampled capacity in organising ever-victorious armies, and a perfect knowledge of the Soudan and its people. Why not send him with *carte blanche* to do the best that can be done? He may not be able single-handed to reduce that raging chaos to order, but the attempt is worth making, and if the attempt is to be made it will have to be made at once.

The initiative thus taken by the *Pall Mall Gazette* was energetically supported by the whole of the British Press. That article appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette* on the 9th of January. On the 10th of January Lord Granville renewed his attempt to induce Lord Cromer to accept General Gordon. He telegraphed: "Could General Charles Gordon or Sir Charles Wilson be of assistance, under altered circumstances, in Egypt?" But Lord Cromer was obdurate. On the 22nd of December he had intimated to Lord Granville that if Cherif Pasha resigned "it would be necessary to send an officer of high authority to Khartoum, with full powers to withdraw the garrisons, and to make the best arrangements he could for the future of the country." He had taken no steps to appoint any such officer.

Nineteen days later, he discussed the matter with Nubar Pasha, and came to the conclusion that the best plan would be to send Abdul Kader Pasha. This was the tardy alternative put forward by him in order to defeat the appointment of General Gordon. But Abdul Kader refused to go, and Lord Cromer was left without any alternative, without any agent to execute the policy which he forced upon the Khedive's Government. The situation was most critical. Nearly two entire months had been allowed to slip away without any steps whatever being taken, either to place a competent soldier in command at Khartoum, or to open the Berber-Suakin route, by which means alone it was possible to withdraw the garrisons. But this did not seem to trouble Lord Cromer. He went on day after day allowing the precious moments to slip by, not only refraining from ringing the alarm-bell, but refusing to listen to the alarm-bell when it roused the Government at home to action, and absolutely vetoing the one definite indispensable step necessary for carrying out the policy for which he was responsible!

The interview with General Gordon aroused the nation to a sense of its responsibility for the safety of the garrisons. Every day it

became obvious that evacuation by massacre, "the Policy of the "Bloody Sponge," with "Let the Garrisons be Speared" as its formula, had revolted the moral sense of the country. Even Downing Street was aroused, and endeavoured to prod Lord Cromer into action. As far back as December 13th Lord Granville had authorised the expenditure of Egyptian revenues "for securing the "safe retreat of the garrisons still holding positions in the Soudan." (Vol. I. p. 379.) A month had passed and Lord Cromer had not spent a penny piece for that purpose. The Press at home was growing every day more violent in its demands that something should be done to secure the safety of the garrisons. Lord Cromer did—nothing. Nay, he did less than nothing, for he vetoed the appointment of Gordon, and nominated an Egyptian Pasha,—who refused the employment offered him!

The alarm-bell of the Press was rung louder and louder at home, but the tocsin which roused Downing Street failed to disturb the repose of the procrastinator at Cairo. At last, the situation becoming even more desperate, the Government perceiving that Lord Cromer would do nothing and had done nothing, decided to bow to the unanimous wish of the country, and send out General Gordon. He at least would do something to carry out the policy to which Lord Cromer had committed the Government, but which he himself had done nothing whatever to carry out.

The possible appointment of General Gordon was notified to Lord Cromer on January 15th. On January 18th General Gordon left London for the Soudan.

"General Gordon's appointment," I am quoting from Lord Cromer, "the *Pall Mall Gazette* said, with perfect truth, was 'applauded "enthusiastically by the Press all over the country without distinction "of party.'" Nor was it only the Press. Lord Cromer tells us that the Government wished it strongly. That Nubar Pasha concurred. That Sir Evelyn Wood and Colonel Watson both wanted Gordon to be sent out. So did Sir Samuel Baker and Lord Wolseley. So did everybody who knew anything about the Soudan or about General Gordon. "I believed," says Lord Cromer, "that at that time I stood "alone in hesitating to employ General Gordon, and I thought that "as everybody differed from me, I must be wrong." (Vol. I. p. 437.)

It may surely be argued that when the whole nation, from Ministers and military authorities down to the man in the street, was unanimous in demanding General Gordon's appointment, the Press was only discharging its elementary duty in voicing this unanimous conviction with sufficient emphasis to give the Ministers of the Crown moral courage enough to over-ride the obstructive and obstinate agent who had been sent to Cairo to carry out their policy.

Any doubt on that subject is, however, dispelled by Lord Cromer's own admissions in his telegrams to Lord Granville of January 16th. The day after the Government hinted to him their desire to send out

General Gordon, he telegraphed asking the Government to "select a well qualified British officer to go to Khartoum with full powers to conduct the retreat" (Vol. I. p. 426.) This was just 45 days by the almanac after he had telegraphed forbidding General Gordon's appointment when it was first proposed, because Cherif objected to having a Christian in high command. (Vol. I. p. 424.) Now he saw a Christian officer was necessary, but it was just forty-five days too late!

But more decisive evidence remains behind. Can it be believed that Lord Cromer on January 16th actually sent a private telegram to Lord Granville saying:—

GORDON WOULD BE THE BEST MAN if he will pledge himself to carry out the policy of withdrawing from the Soudan as quickly as is possible consistently with saving life. I WOULD RATHER HAVE HIM THAN ANY ONE ELSE, provided there is a perfectly clear understanding with him as to what his position is to be and what line of policy is to be carried out. (Vol. I. p. 426.)

Both Lord Cromer's conditions were complied with, and if he had insisted upon them on December 2nd, they would have been complied with then.

So we see that so far from Lord Cromer being *Athanasius contra mundum* he was, on his own confession, convinced that, given two perfectly obvious conditions, Gordon was "the best man" and whom he "would rather have than anybody else!"

So falls the curtain on the second act, with the superior prescience and the wisdom of the Press attested by the British Agent who for seven long weeks had been able to baffle the wishes of the nation by his policy of impotence and procrastination.

THIRD PERIOD, THE RIDE TO THE MAHDI, JAN. 18TH TO FEB. 18TH.

When the curtain rises on the third act we find the same sharp antagonism between the Official and the Journalist, and, as usual, we find the superior sagacity of the Journalist attested by the Official—when it was too late.

When Lord Cromer assented to General Gordon's appointment, he stipulated that the soldier at Khartoum must be under the orders of the Bureaucrat at Cairo. He telegraphed to Lord Granville:—"He (Gordon) must also fully understand that he must take his instructions from the British representative in Egypt and report to him." And in his book he adds this explanation:—

The reason why I said this was that I knew something of General Gordon's erratic character, and I thought that the only chance of keeping him to his task was to appeal to his sense of discipline. (Vol. I. p. 426.)

That was the view of the Official. Far different was the view of

the Journalist. The day after he left London on his perilous mission the *Pall Mall Gazette* wrote that Gordon's mission

is doomed to certain and disastrous failure, followed by a hurricane of denunciation and unpopularity, if it is trammelled by conditions fatal to its success. Either General Gordon is to have a free hand or he is not. If he is he may succeed. If he is not he is certain to fail. General Gordon was fully informed concerning the general outlines of the ministerial policy, and he undertook to carry it out as best he could. That being so, he should be left to carry it out in his own way without being hampered by restrictions drafted by men who know little or nothing of a subject all the details of which he has at his fingers' ends. January 19th.

What happened? General Gordon, on his way out to Egypt, conceived the daring scheme of carrying out his pacific mission by acting upon one of those heroic impulses which had achieved success as by a miracle in China, in Basutoland, in Abyssinia, and in the Soudan itself. As usual, he kept his own counsel. But before leaving Cairo he left the following message to be given to Clifford Lloyd:—

Tell Lloyd no panics. It is possible that I may go to the Mahdi and not be heard of for two months, for he might keep me as a hostage for Zobeir.

Unfortunately, Lord Cromer got wind of this and telegraphed to General Gordon at Berber the following peremptory orders, which Mr. Gladstone afterwards described as a "dissuasive telegram."

I hope you will give me a positive assurance that you will on no account put yourself voluntarily in the power of the Mahdi. The question is not a personal one. There would, in my opinion, be the strongest political objections to your risking a visit to the Mahdi. (Egypt, 1884, No. 16, p. 1.)

General Gordon had to take his instructions from Lord Cromer, who did not appeal in vain to his sense of discipline. He telegraphed:—

I understand your desire to be the pacification of the country without bloodshed and the formation of native government. Also that on public grounds I am to run no risks. I will fulfil your orders.* (Egypt, 1884, No. 12, p. 88.)

It is not necessary to discuss the question whether General Gordon was right in believing that could he but meet the Mahdi face to face he could have induced him to acquiesce in a policy of Soudan for the Soudanese, and the unhindered evacuation of the garrisons. He may have been right. He may have been wrong. But it was his policy, and he was over-ruled by Lord Cromer. At the very outset of his mission his trump card was snatched from his hand by Lord Cromer.

On January 29th I had protested, not knowing Lord Cromer's fatal intention to tie General Gordon's hand behind his back, against

* Lord Cromer paraphrases this reply as follows:—

"In reply General Gordon telegraphed me that he had no intention of visiting the Mahdi." Comment is needless.

the notion that he was not to be allowed to risk his life, out of regard to his own safety. "General Gordon is of all men best able to appreciate his danger, and since it is his choice to go alone, it is not for us to limit his freedom out of anxiety for his life." *P.M.C.*, January 29th.

The very evil I had foreseen happened within seven days.

No one can pretend that Gordon's romantic project of riding alone into the Mahdi's camp to negotiate in person for the safe retreat of the garrisons was not in full accord with the broad lines of the policy which he was sent to carry out. But he was over-riden, checked, and thwarted by Lord Cromer, who thereby destroyed what he himself admits was the best chance of success.

Lord Cromer writes, after the lapse of nearly a quarter of a century:—

I have already stated that it was, in my opinion, a mistake ever to have sent General Gordon to the Soudan. Once sent, however, the best chance of success lay in adopting the course advocated by the *Pall Mall Gazette*. General Gordon should have had *carte blanche* to do the best that could be done so long as he conformed to the broad lines of the policy which he was sent to carry out. I saw this from the first. (Vol. I. p. 477.)

FOURTH PERIOD, ZOBEIR, FEB. 18TH TO MARCH 9TH

Act four opens with General Gordon at Khartoum, where he arrived on February 18th. Forbidden to go to the Mahdi himself he sent him an embassy, offering him the Sultanship of West Darfur if he would give up his prisoners and allow Gordon ten months in which to get the garrisons out of the country. The Mahdi debated this offer for twenty days in council, and finally, after much dubitation, decided to reject it. If Gordon had been present at the council, the result, judging by previous experience, might have been very different.

It should never be forgotten that Lord Cromer, Mr. Gladstone, and all the Ministers laid great stress upon the double aspect of General Gordon's mission. It had been laid down from the first that he was not merely to withdraw the garrisons, he was to provide for the future government of the country. No one insisted upon this more strongly than Lord Cromer himself. He told Lord Granville that the only wise course was to create a bulwark between Egypt and the Mahdi, and he expressed his "entire concurrence" in General Gordon's contention that "the two questions of withdrawing the garrisons and of arranging for the future government of the country cannot be separated." March 14th, Vol. I. p. 525.

Now before General Gordon left Cairo he told Lord Cromer that in order to execute his mission he must take Zobeir Pasha with him "at once" to Khartoum.

I feel sure that his going would settle the Soudan affair to the benefit of Her Majesty's and Egyptian Governments, and I would bear the responsibility of recommending it. (Vol. I. p. 456.)

That was on January 26th. What did Lord Cromer do? True to his policy of always being too late, he recoiled from allowing General Gordon a free hand. So far from giving him *carte blanche*, which, he admitted, was "the best chance of success," he thwarted him again. "For General Gordon to grasp an idea," said Colonel Stewart, "was to act on it at once." Not so Lord Cromer. For him to grasp an idea was to postpone acting upon it until it was too late.

In vain General Gordon implored, warned, threatened, Lord Cromer was obdurate.

Every day was precious. Days, however, lengthened into weeks. Week followed week, and still Lord Cromer's sluggish temperament could not be roused to yield to General Gordon's urgent, almost piteous prayers, so far as to demand from the Government at home permission to let Gordon have Zobeir. Not until March 4th could he bring himself to withdraw his objection to Zobeir's going at once to Khartoum. Even then he wished to postpone his decision until after another interview with Zobeir. (Vol. I, p. 505.)

He had procrastinated from January 26th to March 5th, thirty-nine irrecoverable days. Not until four days later did he venture to ask the Government to "settle the question without delay." (Vol. I. p. 515.)

It was then too late to convince the Government at home of the need of instant decision. He had infected Downing Street with his own inability to see the need for instant action. An agitation had sprung up in England against the employment of Zobeir. Mr. Gladstone could not bring his Cabinet to face the storm. The appointment of Zobeir was forbidden. And General Gordon's second trump card was lost.

If this was the action of the Official, what was the attitude of the Press? The *Pall Mall Gazette* recommended the appointment of Zobeir four days after the news arrived of the Hicks disaster. Four days after Lord Cromer first vetoed the appointment of General Gordon, it again pressed for the despatch of Zobeir to the Soudan. After General Gordon demanded his appointment it declared that "it was an infinitely more humane project than the alternative now apparently contemplated by the Government of leaving all the petty Sultans, from Khartoum to Gondokoro, to enslave each other's subjects without the check of any controlling authority." March 1st.

With these facts before us it is not difficult to see whether it was the Journalist or the Official who was more alert, more farseeing and more prompt in recognising what ought to have been done at once and done in time.

Let Lord Cromer himself be judge between us. He says:—

I believe that if when General Gordon sent his first telegram on the subject from Khartoum, the Government had stated that they had no insuperable objections to the employment of Zobeir Pasha, the course of events in the Soudan might possibly have

been changed. When once General Gordon was supported by Colonel Stewart I should have yielded to the pressure that Zobeir Pasha should have been despatched to Khartoum at once, to which at first I was very reluctant to consent. It is not improbable that the announcement of his departure would have prevented the tribes round Khartoum who were wavering from joining the Mahdi. But the favourable moment was very fleeting. Regarded in the light of after events it was evident that the discussion of this subject was prolonged for a fortnight longer than was necessary. The propitious moment had been allowed to slip by. (Vol. I. p. 529.)

That this chance was lost was not the fault of the Press. It was the fault of Lord Cromer.

FIFTH PERIOD, CUT OFF, MARCH 9TH TO 16TH.

The fifth and last act of this tragedy finds Lord Cromer once more opposing action where it was possible to act, and waking too late to recommend action when the time for action had passed by.

When General Gordon found that he was refused Zobeir, he at once realised that it was no longer possible to achieve the second part of his mission, and asked for instructions to concentrate upon the saving of the Khartoum garrison. (Vol. I. p. 519.)

To accomplish even this limited fragment of his mission it was necessary to open the road to Berber. Otherwise, even the Khartoum garrison could not be saved. Again and again General Gordon telegraphed, begging and imploring Lord Cromer to send a small British Indian force to Berber.

The Official at Cairo telegraphed to Lord Granville on March 4th: "I cannot agree with the proposal that a force of British or Indian cavalry should be sent through from Suakin to Berber."

The *Pall Mall Gazette* pressed passionately for the reversal of this decision.

Then, on the 16th March, twelve days too late, the Official opened his eyes and saw what had been as plain as a pikestaff to all but himself and telegraphed:—

"It has now (*sic*, only now!) become of the utmost importance to open the road between Suakin and Berber."

Once again too late!

On the 14th March the Sheikh el Obeid had declared in favour of the Mahdi, and the tribes between Berber and Shendy were in revolt.

But what was the last telegram Lord Cromer tried to get through when General Gordon asked for permission to evacuate Khartoum? Will it be believed that Lord Cromer telegraphed: "Hold on to 'Khartoum'!" Yet that does not prevent him from holding General Gordon up to condemnation as a man who "threw his instructions to 'the winds,' who 'did not even try to do his duty,' who subordinated the interests of the State to his personal opinions—and why?

Because he did not evacuate Khartoum!

That ends the story. After that Gordon was hemmed in, utterly unable to extricate himself, much less the garrisons.

The Press at least is free from such inconsistency as this. Nor has it tried to vindicate its own reputation by aspersing the character of a hero sacrificed by the incorrigible procrastination of his accuser.

EPILOGUE.

Lord Cromer left Cairo on April 21st. Gordon's mission had failed when he was hemmed in at Khartoum a month earlier.

Even now Lord Cromer does not believe the garrisons were in danger of massacre. The answer to that is that not only were many of them speared, but six millions of the inhabitants of the Soudan perished. Here again even to the last it was the Press which had more foresight than the Official.

On March 7th, on the abandonment of the Soudan, without setting up any government at Khartoum, the *Pall Mall Gazette* said:—

"It would mean universal throat-cutting, tempered by constant "slave raids. Each petty Sultan would organise man-hunts on his "neighbour's subjects, and the valley of the Nile would be the cockpit "of the Continent."

Such was the forecast. Let Lord Cromer himself supply the story of its fulfilment.

The researches made by Sir Reginald Wingate into the past and present population of the Soudan brings into strong relief the terrible results that ensued from Dervish misrule. It is estimated that prior to the establishment of the Mahdi's power the population of the Soudan was about 8½ millions, of these about 3½ millions were swept away by famine and by disease—notably by small pox, and 3½ millions were killed either in the engagements with the British and Egyptian troops or in inter-tribal wars. The latter of these two causes accounted fully for the greater portion of the terrible mortality in warfare. (Vol. II. p. 545.)

W. T. STEAD

EDUCATION *SUB DIO*.

A GREAT change in the methods and aims of National Education seems imminent. A sense of profound discontent with the results of our primary system, after nearly forty years of State control, and after a full century of national effort, has turned the minds of practical men and women towards the transformation of certain factors in education, in the hope that problems now insoluble will thereby become soluble. It is true that some professional teachers and educationalists are still content to follow current methods. They think that sixty to eighty infants can be properly trained in one class-room by one good teacher, and that there is nothing in the nature of things that makes it impossible for one teacher to take this number of infants or older children. With these patient and hopeful people it is the *word* that educates. Their pupils apparently belong to the phonographic grade of souls. The children leave school ignorant both of *things* and of *life*, and have to learn for themselves, unaided and unguided, out of school the things that they ought to have learnt in school. It is no wonder that Dr. Sadler is pleading with his accustomed power and eloquence for Continuation Schools that shall help the great multitude of children who leave school at the statutory age dull, uneducated and unprepared for life. Education is unsuccessful to-day in elementary schools for the same reason that it was unsuccessful when it dealt with the highest class of intellect in the Middle Ages before the Renaissance. Nature was, and is, left out of account. But, fortunately, in early days it was only dispensed with in the greater secondary schools and the universities, and the raw material of the nation was not deprived of the educative forces of Nature. To-day the intensity of town life excludes childhood from the influence of those beneficial forces, while the educational methods that are intentionally (one must presume) designed to supply the loss of natural conditions, in fact intensify the evil by basing education upon words and not upon things. Nor does the indictment of our

educational system stop there. That system too often combines the two evils from which the poorest school children suffer. The school for children living in the slum areas is built in the slum areas where the children live, and the teachers who teach in those poorest schools are too often teachers who have been brought up in the old mechanical methods of instructing large classes, and who have grown sad and dispirited in the hopeless fight against such conditions. What educational chance has a child who is born in a slum, who is taught in a school built in the same slum, by a teacher who has taught in that slum for thirty years? Such children ought to be taught in schools built on high ground in good surroundings, with the best, the most skilled and the most efficient teachers that the country can supply, and, wherever and whenever possible, the teaching should be given in the open air, in the parks and open spaces that are now happily available in close proximity to every crowded area. All other educational systems can but perpetuate the slum mind which is the despair of our civilisation. It is a significant mark of our present position that one of the chief functions of the Continuation School is to root up the seeds sown in the primary school.

A growing belief in the return to Nature is perhaps the most hopeful sign in the educational world to-day. The fact to wonder at is the long delay in the advent of such a movement. The conception is as old as education itself, and there has been no age of which we have any scholastic record that does not supply us with striking instances of education based upon the study of things and the observation of life in Nature. The born schoolmaster instinctively adopts such methods, and through them secures results obtainable in no other way. Under such a system the slum mind will be abolished, and the solution of social problems that are the direct product of that mind will become possible. It is a national matter, and demands the earnest attention of statesmen and educationalists alike.

The Report on Open-air Education recently issued by the Board of Education* gathers together from numerous experiments the practical information necessary to a schoolmaster or schoolmistress who determines to incorporate the open-air or outdoor method of education in the general scheme of the school life. It is unnecessary here to repeat such practical information. The object of this brief article is to lay weight on the necessity of all schools in crowded areas adopting this method of education as part of the normal curriculum of the school. I may, however, refer to the Report as showing that there is no school in the land, however poor, however badly equipped, that cannot supplement its needs by means of Nature study and school journeys. There is no excuse whatever

* "School Excursions and Vacation Schools," by the present writer. (Cd. 3,866.)

for not adopting an organised return to Nature and life as the motive force of education in every school in the country. The Legislature, indeed, by Section 13 of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act, 1907, has made special provision for the adoption of this new method by declaring that

The powers and duties of a local education authority under Part III. of the Education Act, 1902, shall include power to provide for children attending a public elementary school, vacation schools, vacation classes, play centres, or other means of recreation during their holidays, or at such other times as the local education authority may prescribe, in the school-house or in some other suitable place in the vicinity, so far as the local education authority, in the case of a school-house or place not belonging to them, can obtain for the purpose the use of the school house or place.

The section goes on to provide for the medical inspection of children, gives power "to make such arrangements as may be sanctioned by the Board of Education for attending to the health and physical condition of the children educated in public elementary schools," and provides "that in any exercise of powers under this section, the local education authority may encourage and assist the establishment or continuance of voluntary agencies, and associate with itself representatives of voluntary associations for the purpose."

These wide powers will enable local education authorities to sanction, help and even promote fully thought-out schemes that will bring the whole principle of the return to Nature into play in the schools. The chief difficulty that remains is the teachers. Many are enthusiastic advocates of the change, especially in London. But others—and those sometimes are in chief command of important schools in poor districts—will have nothing to do with this enlargement of school life. School journeys and excursions, and the elaborate preparation and co-ordination with the ordinary school work involved in the new departure, necessitate work out of school hours, and time for this they are not prepared to give. Men of this type grow rarer in the school world, and are certainly not fit members of their noble profession. But that there are such men I know, and it is difficult to see how their malign influence can be eliminated until the school journey becomes, under the Regulations of the Board of Education, a necessary part of the curriculum of every school.

This leads me to the consideration of the general functions of outdoor education in any national educational system. First, we must consider its relation to the system as a whole; secondly, its relation to the particular school; and, lastly, its relation to the particular child. When we reflect upon the vast army of children now subject to the supervision, in educational matters, of the State, the thought arises that a considerable percentage of these children need, more than anything else, some method of mental and physical

development that will enable them there and then, as well as in after life, to resist the difficulties of their environment. They are more subject to sickness and disease, and have less necessary sleep, than the children of well-to-do parents; their home life, though often enough as happy as or happier than that of the rich, is most deficient in beauty, and is intensely monotonous; they are subject to temptations not placed before other children; they are familiar with vices, such as drunkenness, unknown to the children of a richer class. They are not unhappy unless they are hungry or cold or sick, for childhood is the time of happiness, but they are often hungry or cold or sick, and in need of the tenderness that is not to be found. It is here that outdoor education can play its great part in the lower levels of our educational system. The children, especially quite little children, can, in the course of the daily curriculum, be taken into neighbouring parks and open spaces, and be definitely taught the meaning of things and the range and measure of life: beast, bird, insect, bud, leaf, flower, tree, hillside, meadow, stream, sky, and all that therein shines; all and each have lessons of reality and beauty that mean more to the after life of the child than any amount of monotonous repetition of unrealised facts in the schoolroom. In the summer the classes should be held out of doors. Experiments show not only that outdoor class work is feasible, but that it is magical in its effect on the child mind.

Experience, however, proves that we must go farther than this. Defective children should have no other teaching than that which can be given out of doors, or what is definitely related to out-of-door work. The Osea Island Open Air School is a revelation in educational method. But sick children need help of this kind more than any others, after we have dealt with the defective children. Forest Schools of Charlottenburg and Gladbach bring back life to Germany, Switzerland and Holland have solved this problem. The children who are moping in the earlier stages of organic complaints, anæmia or functional weakness. "The children are brought each day to school, under sound medical and hygienic appliances and surroundings. The fresh air, the irradiation of sunlight, the giving of salt baths, the careful restriction of the amount of instruction given and the number of scholars taught, have had the most beneficial effect." In Dr. Bion's Holiday Colonies, at Zürich, anæmic, weak-lunged and nervous children are rapidly, and at the lowest cost, restored to perfect health. The Health Colonies of Holland do the same. These countries have realised that there is nothing more expensive to a nation than to rear a class of weaklings. It is not only the cry of the children that should touch our hearts. The economic loss must also touch our minds. Life is the thing that matters to a nation, and we are prodigal of it. We waste a hundred thousand infant lives annually because the mothers of our race are brought

up in ignorance, and we waste a good many more than a hundred thousand lives of elder children yearly because we have no sense of precaution in our educational system. With the new legislation as to medical inspection, it will be possible to sort out the children who are in any way in need of special care, and these should receive the outdoor treatment that will make them fit and strong and capable of taking up the burden and the pleasures of normal school life. But that normal life must include, as part of its daily curriculum, an intimate acquaintance with Nature. When all is said and done, man's life is still and must ever be a ceaseless wrestling match with Nature; and if man is to conquer in the struggle with realities the child must be brought face to face with them.

This leads me to the particular school. The function of open-air education in the school is not merely, or indeed chiefly, the bringing of the scholar into immediate relationship with the phenomena of Nature, though that is in itself of vast importance. The educational value of the school walk or journey or excursion, of open-air lectures and classes, of outdoor demonstrations, is that the method should act as an educational keystone, so to speak—as something that knits into useful reality the entire learning of the school and of school life. By means of the school journey or excursion the whole curriculum should be brought into focus and given a clear outline and a sense of reality. History, geography, literature, science, can by this means be made realities. Men and things will have their being in the child's mind and will react on his conception of his own life. Life to be of value must, like baser assets, be realised, and it can only be realised by a clear comprehension of the value of other lives and things to which it stands in relation. If you can take a child to a particular place and say, "Here this event, that altered the course of the world, happened. Those very hills, these very walls, saw it happen. Here Harold fell; here John signed the Great Charter; here Elizabeth was born; here Charles I. died," and so forth, the interest that is vital in education awakes, and the mind begins to think about the meaning of things. The school journey should be subtly related to every item of the work in school, so that no precious moment of youth-time is lost for ever.

It must be remembered that all this will react on the officers who lead and command the great army of children. It will mean, however, more work for the teachers. But the interest of the work will lighten its weight. At present numberless teachers break down from the terrible strain of endeavouring to teach classes of excessive size. Mechanical teaching necessarily lacks interest, and ultimately its dead weight overpowers the brain or the nerves or both. When real interest is created in the scholars this is not so. The hardest worked teachers whom I know in London use every method of open-air education in their power, with the result that they

remain well and vigorous where other teachers break down. The teachers need interest at least as much as the children, and it would, therefore, seem to be an essential of the future training of teachers that they should receive special instruction in the art of relating the ordinary curriculum to the school journey and other forms of open-air instruction. That English teachers, both male and female, are peculiarly adapted to this form of instruction the many experiments of the last few years prove absolutely. The extraordinary success that has accompanied and followed experiments made in schools all over the country—a standard of success not reached, I believe, even in Germany—proves that it only remains for the open-air system to be adopted on a large scale for it absolutely to revolutionise the results obtained in past years in the English schools. And we must remember that the end aimed at is not merely mental improvement and advance. The physique of the child is at least as important, while moral and, one may venture to add, spiritual effects are definite ends in view. Dull children under the influence of open-air instruction are found to become bright; the moral faculties expand, the physical nature rejoices, the whole being turns like a flower to the sun. It is possible under such conditions for religion to become, as other things have become, a reality.

The particular child, indeed, is the charge of every educational system. The good of that system is to enable this child to realise all his potential qualities that make for goodness, and to eradicate all his potential qualities that make for evil. He is, indeed, an arrow in the hand of a giant. We can speed him whither we will, though in the past we have more often than not unbalanced his feathers of flight and left him to the bow of chance. That this will be the case in the future seems unbelievable, for to-day the nation has awakened at last to the value and the national need of an educational system that will bring into action all that is best in every child. That we have such a system no educationalist would admit. Until the youngest and the poorest children have the best and the most highly trained teachers, we can scarcely be said to have learnt the first lesson that a truly national system has to teach. At present, in the case of thousands of tiny children, the least competent teachers are in charge. Until classes are halved in size, until sickly children receive special treatment, until school buildings are removed altogether from slum areas,* until every town school has a country "camp," until the half-time system is a blot on a closed chapter of educational history, until continuation schools

* No doubt in many cases it is impossible to remove the school, but it is generally possible to remove, by the exercise of public powers, the slum, and it is always possible to acquire land around the school, and to turn this additional land into a beautiful garden, which will re-act, not only on the children, but on the whole slum area. In future, however, there can be no excuse for building schools in the heart of densely populated districts.

are a fact instead of a fancy, our national system of education will be inefficient, and on the whole unremunerative. But all these things are within the vista of things possible, and the individual child has before him an educational future that no one could have predicted ten years ago. The outdoor system of education, the open-air conception, makes progress, rapid progress, seem possible. The idea has suddenly developed on every side. Every schoolmaster, every schoolmistress, worthy of the name is full of it. We, at last, see ripe before us the fruit from seeds sown long ago by the great educationalists. Ideas grow unheeded in this strange world. Thoughts that seem obvious to great thinkers sink deep into the soil that is the mind of nations, and lie there apparently dead and quite forgotten. They germinate untended, and grow into vigorous life. Suddenly they are perceived, and a whole nation is gathering the fruit. So it has been with the true idea of education. We are all realists touched with idealism to-day, and neither Comenius, Pestalozzi, Herbart, nor Froebel has anything further to teach us. We believe that the goal of each of these great Educationalists will be reached when the schoolmaster goes to Nature to learn how to teach, and carries her methods into the schoolroom, making reality take the place of form and interest the place of routine. We must not, however, underrate the difficulties that lie before the Educationalists of this country. They are sufficiently appalling. We have a frightful problem to solve—the education of some seven million children who claim to be treated as seven million individuals, each possessing infinite possibilities, and each with the potential power to do something for the community that not one of the others could perform. Is the problem soluble? The answer of the open sky is—Yes.

J. E. G. DE MONTMORENCY.

THE RAISING OF LAZARUS

PERHAPS no point in Professor Burkitt's brilliant work, "The Gospel History and its Transmission," stands out more conspicuously than his argument that the Fourth Gospel cannot be historical, because the Synoptists do not record the raising of Lazarus. Of course he is far above the reckless criticism which summarily sets down every omission to ignorance. He is well aware that an *argumentum e silentio* is precarious, unless particular reason can be given why the omitted fact should have been recorded. He fully allows that no argument can be based on the omission of an ordinary incident. But, says he, and quite rightly, the raising of Lazarus is not an ordinary incident. It not only made a great stir at the time, but is actually the turning-point of our Lord's life, for it directly caused the decision to put him to death. Now if the story were historical, the Synoptists must have known it; and if they knew it, they must have recorded it—which they have not done. Therefore he concludes that the story is not historical. And if the raising of Lazarus is not historical, we can all agree that neither is the Fourth Gospel, as a whole, historical.

Though it might be too much to call this reasoning reckless, I cannot think it sound. In a very literal and real sense, Professor Burkitt has still to begin his study of the question. I join issue at the statement that if the Synoptists knew the fact, they must have recorded it. How can we presume to say that an author *must* record this or that, before we have made sure what sort of book he meant to write? This is the first step of the investigation, and it decides all that follows; yet Professor Burkitt has entirely overlooked it. He never gives a thought to the matter, but takes it as self-evident that the Evangelists cannot have deliberately omitted any fact which a modern historian would think important. Till this is proved, his argument is in the air. Yet is it not evident that their interest in facts is not historical, but religious? St. Luke's careful determination of a single date is the exception which proves the rule. In this respect the Gospels resemble the "Lives of the Saints," as, for example, Adamnan's "Life of Columba," which gives us a very good idea of the man, but is singularly barren of historical information. So here

the purpose of the Evangelists is not to satisfy the historian's curiosity, but to show what manner of man the Lord was. They do not seem even to care about recording the most astonishing displays of power they could hear of—as if it would be superfluous for one who knew the raising of Lazarus to relate the raisings of Jairus' daughter and the widow's son at Nain. If the story of Lazarus is one of marvellous delicacy and tenderness, the others are not behind it in this respect. Is it certain that they could not have deliberately preferred to relate one of these?

In truth, it is as well not to be too sure about the motives of the Synoptists. It is generally agreed that their narratives are much earlier than St. John's; and from Eastern customs and the evidence of the Epistles and St. Luke we may further conclude that many of them were fixed in systematic oral teaching long before they were fixed in writing. The Synoptic problem is not an affair of documents only. Now the insertion or omission of a particular story in a particular series may often have been decided by local or personal circumstances quite unknown to us. It is idle to dogmatise in a case where the uncertainty is so great; but if we take a hint from the marked reticence of St. Luke about the family at Bethany, we may be inclined to guess that the Synoptists left out the story of Lazarus, whom the Jews sought to kill, just as they have omitted the name of the disciple who struck off the servant's ear. There are many stories, even some of passing notoriety, which no right-minded man will care to publish till certain persons have been placed by death beyond the reach of danger: and the raising of Lazarus may very well have been one of these.

But, says Professor Burkitt, it actually caused the decision to put him to death. In a sense, that decision was only a question of sooner or later. The Pharisees had long ago taken counsel with the Herodians (roughly, the Sadducees) to put him to death, and they had taken much counsel since then for the purpose. But the dominant Sadducees seem to have been unwilling to help them—for their help was effective when they did give it. Why should they help? No doubt the prophet of Nazareth was a pestilent fellow, but he had not attacked *them* very much; and if he was a thorn in the side of the Pharisees, that was a reason for letting him alone. But now even the Sadducees were alarmed at the stir made by the raising of Lazarus; and when Caiaphas went over to the Pharisees, the way was clear for a decision. Our Lord gave His life for Lazarus in a special sense. St. John seems to tell the story partly as a preface to the decision, much as he relates the Feeding of the Five Thousand with a view to the discourse at Capernaum.

But Professor Burkitt takes the decision too much as an isolated fact. The debates of the Sanhedrin form a series in St. John, standing out as conspicuously as the mentions of Herod Antipas in

St. Luke. Like these, they seem to imply some source of private information; and we know whereabouts that source was. St. John tells us incidentally that he "was known to the high priest"; and there is no reason to set aside his statement. His knowledge of Caiaphas is not likely to have been intimate; yet it was hardly of the slightest, if the servants recognised him, and let him bring in a stranger. And if St. John was known to the high priest, he was likely enough to meet with other members of the Sanhedrin even during the Saviour's lifetime. And if he lived at Jerusalem for many years, he must have been familiar, not only with such members of the Sanhedrin as became Christians, but with, perhaps, a larger class of them, who, without abandoning Judaism, were willing to be on friendly terms with individual Christians. Such a class was common among the heathens, and cannot have been wanting in Judæa. James the Just had many such friends, in times before his murder made the enmity of Jew and Christian deadly. So it would seem that the proceedings of that stormy meeting were not matter of common knowledge, but came to St. John through private information which is not likely to have reached the Synoptists. If, then, they knew quite well the raising of Lazarus, we cannot assume that they also knew the fact which (from the historical point of view) makes it so much more important than the raisings of Jairus' daughter and the widow's son at Nain. If so, Professor Burkitt's argument falls to the ground.

He further tells us that "there is no room for" the raising of Lazarus in St. Mark's narrative. No doubt Mark ix. x. reads as if the events covered only a few days. But St. Mark neither says nor implies this; and there are several points where an interval might be supposed without contradicting him. If then another writer tells us events of such an interval, there is no presumption against him.

Speaking generally, I am afraid Professor Burkitt has not put with his usual skill the dilemma—history or romance. He tells us that the omission of the baptism by St. John and the institution of the Lord's Supper is "disingenuous," and "a deliberate sacrifice" of truth. So it would be if St. John were writing a *Life of Christ* in the modern style—which he expressly says he is not. But if he is only selecting a few incidents to show the self-revelation of the incarnate Word, he has a right to leave out facts of great importance in a general way which he himself thinks less useful for his particular purpose; and such omission is no presumption against the facts he does record. Selection is one thing, romance is another.

I trust it will not be supposed that I undervalue Professor Burkitt's most suggestive work if I have taken from it only some of the points on which I cannot see my way to agree with him. Only the chapter on the Fourth Gospel seems a weak part, which I hope he will some day make as good as the rest.

H. M. GWATKIN.

THE BLACK ART OF VIVISECTION.

THE vivisectors and their friends have for many years hoped to win over the favour of the public and to justify their practices by the assertion that priceless benefits have been conferred on mankind and the art of medicine by experiments upon living animals; and although the question of the justification of vivisection is essentially a moral one, and has nothing whatever to do with the results, beneficial or otherwise, that may ensue from it, yet it is permissible to those who oppose vivisection to investigate these claims for what they are worth as a test of the accuracy of statement and scientific knowledge of those who put these claims forward. The vivisectors, one and all, claim to be men of science, and if their claim is to be conceded to them the statements they make as to the benefits conferred upon mankind ought to be based upon indisputable statistics. The only such statistics which can be relied upon as a scientific basis of any claim made by the vivisectors that through their practices diseases have been cured more readily, and lives therefore saved, are the figures recorded at Somerset House by the Registrar-General, in which, year by year, the death-rate per million persons living in the whole of England and Wales from the various diseases that attack mankind are annually recorded. Statistics compiled over small areas or at particular hospitals by persons anxious to puff a prophylactic or push a serum can have no scientific value whatever in comparison with the national and inevitable records collected by the Registrar-General.

With the desire to test the scientific accuracy of the claims of the vivisectors, I have compared those claims with the Registrar-General's returns, and I propose to record the results of my investigations.

ANTHRAX.

Mr. Morris, President of the Royal College of Surgeons, in his evidence before the Royal Commission, said: "inoculations against

"anthrax have now been employed since twenty-five years ago, and "wherever employed the losses from the disease have sunk into "insignificance," but the context of this evidence seems to indicate that Mr. Morris may have been directing his remarks to the deaths from the disease among sheep and cattle; if so, they cannot be tested by reference to the Registrar-General's returns, which only deal with human beings; but to the unprejudiced investigator it would be natural to assume that a treatment discovered from vivisection which proved so beneficial to sheep and cattle would be of some value in mitigating the same disease in human beings, and deducing the death-rate from it. To this deduction, however, the Registrar-General's figures oppose an insuperable obstacle. The death-rates per million persons living, gathered into quinquennial periods for the twenty years beginning in 1886 and ending in 1905, are as follows* :—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	9
2nd	" " 1891—1895	..	..	7·8
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	...	15·2
4th	" " 1901—1905	...	...	17·4

The death-rate, therefore, seems to have about doubled since the vivisectors have had the opportunity of applying their priceless prophylactics to human beings afflicted with this disease.

CANCER.

The labours of the vivisectors in this field have run to 41,561 experiments upon living animals during the three years 1904-5-6. Cancer of every kind and form has been inflicted by them upon this vast army of suffering animals, but so far from any benefit having accrued to mankind from this welter of misery, the Registrar-General's returns show that the death-rate during the last twenty years has gone steadily up. The figures for each quinquennial period are as follows :—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	632
2nd	" " 1891—1895	...	...	712
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	...	800
4th	" " 1901—1905	...	...	864

It is fair to say that Mr. Morris, F.R.C.S., made the following statement before the Royal Commission :—"As a member of the Executive Committee of the Imperial Cancer Research from its outset, I have "had frequent opportunity of witnessing the complete absence of "suffering in animals the subjects of these cancerous tumours." I do not know whether Mr. Morris intends us to believe that the cancer inflicted upon animals by the vivisectors is a totally different disease

* All the figures in this article are taken from the 68th Report of the Registrar-General.

from that which afflicts human beings, in which case it does not seem wonderful that a cure for the human disease has not been discovered from investigations of a different disease in animals, or whether he would have us believe that cancer is not a painful disease either in man or in animals, or whether the hypothesis is that the same disease which is painful in human beings entails no suffering upon animals. In the latter case the animals suffering from the attentions of the Cancer Research investigators are unfortunately unable to tell us themselves whether they endorse or disagree with Mr. Morris' opinion as to their enjoying a complete immunity from suffering.

DIABETES.

The claim of the vivisectors to have benefited mankind in respect of this disease is succinctly made by Sir Lauder Brunton, himself a vivisector, in his evidence before the Royal Commission. Sir Mackenzie Chalmers asked him (Q. 7,125): "As the result of experiments, can you alleviate diabetes in any way?" and he answered: "Yes, very greatly indeed; because before Bernard's experiments we did not in the least know that the amount of sugar that was passing was due to the conversion of starch into sugar, whereas now we know that, and we limit the diet of the diabetic to proteid foods, cutting off the starches and the sugar as far as possible, and giving them only proteid and fatty foods. In this way we can lessen his sufferings and can prolong his life."

Unfortunately Sir Lauder Brunton forgot to produce any statistics or figures upon which he based this statement. It cannot be true that the lives of diabetic patients are prolonged if the death-rate per million persons living from this disease has gone up, and this unfortunately is the fact as recorded in Somerset House, the following being the figures recording the average death-rate per million persons living for the last twenty years in quinquennial periods:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	62·4
2nd	"	1891—1895	...	69·2
3rd	"	1896—1900	...	81
4th	"	1901—1905	...	89·2

DIPHTHERIA.

The claims of the vivisectors to have robbed this disease of its terrors, and to have prevented people from dying from it, are made with the utmost confidence and persistence constantly in public. Mr. Morris, with the full responsibility of the whole surgical profession behind him, made this statement to the Royal Commission:—"The diminution in the mortality from diphtheria since the introduction of the antitoxin treatment is considerable. There are numerous reports and statistics easy of access which prove the truth of this statement." What these reports and statistics which are available

to everybody may be, Mr. Morris does not tell us. They are certainly not the returns of the Registrar-General, for the average death-rate per million persons living, as recorded for the last thirty years in quinquennial periods, is as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1876—1880	...	...	121
2nd	.. 1881—1885	..	..	156
3rd	.. 1886—1890	...	...	170
4th	.. 1891—1895	..	...	252
5th	.. 1896—1900	..	..	272
6th	.. 1901—1905	...	...	204

The antitoxin treatment was begun in England in the latter part of 1894, which falls at the end of the quinquennial period embracing the years 1891-1895 inclusive. From this it will be seen that the highest death-rate ever recorded took place in the five years of 1896 to 1900, which synchronises with the spread all over England of the antitoxin treatment. During the last five years, 1901-1905, the death-rate seems somewhat to have decreased, but it is still above the death-rate for the whole time from 1876 to 1890, during which time diphtheria patients escaped the attention of the vivisectors.

GLANDERS.

Mr. S. Stockman, M.R.C.V.S., the chief veterinary officer of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, in giving evidence before the Royal Commission, made this statement:—" . . . The practical "utility of these substances (tuberculin and mallein) has been, and "could only have been, demonstrated by experiments on animals "Medically speaking, their discovery makes it possible completely to "stamp out tuberculosis and glanders; that is to say, you can get an "accurate diagnosis." These words either mean nothing at all or they are intended to convey to the Commissioners the impression that glanders can now be stamped out with the help of discoveries made by vivisection. Mr. Stockman produces no statistics or figures to support his statement, and the figures of Somerset House show that since the triumphs of vivisection have been applied to the cure of this disease the death-rate has reached its highest record. I give the quinquennial figures for the last twenty years:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	.	..	4·8
2nd	.. 1891—1895	...	...	4
3rd	.. 1896—1900	...	...	3·6
4th	.. 1901—1905	..	..	5·4

TETANUS.

Here, unfortunately, mankind has not escaped the efforts of the vivisectors, which would seem to provoke this disease to be more fatal. An antitoxin has been discovered for this disease, and was applied

to the unfortunate human race in 1897 for the first time. The result has been a more striking success in raising the death-rate than in almost any other disease. The figures are as follows for the last twenty years:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	1 8
2nd	" " 1891—1895	.	...	1'4
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	..	1'2
4th	" " 1901—1905	..	..	6'2

DISEASES OF THE THYROID BODY.

Myxoedema is classed by the Registrar-General under this heading, and we find that Mr. Stephen Paget can hardly restrain his enthusiasm for the marvellous cures of this disease which he claims to have been effected as the result of vivisection experiments. "Far more," he exclaimed, "has been achieved than the cure of myxoedema. "Even if the discovery stopped here it would still be a miracle that "little bottles of tabloids should bring men and women back from "myxoedema to what they were before they became thick-witted, slow, "changed almost past recognition, drifting towards idiocy." It seems almost unkind to this poor gentleman to administer to his enthusiasm the sedative of the Registrar-General's figures, but scientific accuracy compels me to state that the death-rates from the thyroid body during the last twenty years are thus recorded in quinquennial periods:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	5
2nd	" " 1891—1895	...	...	6'6
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	..	8'8
4th	" " 1901—1905	...	...	13'6

ATROPHY DEBILITY.

I now come to "Atrophy debility." I have been unable to discover from the writings of the vivisectors, or from their evidence before the Royal Commission, any claims founded upon their practices for the alleviation of this malady or the saving of lives from its attacks. But that it should have escaped the attention of the vivisectors seems to have been fortunate for mankind, for the average deaths in the last twenty years, grouped in quinquennial periods, are recorded by the Registrar-General as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	778
2nd	" " 1891—1895	..	...	719
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	...	641
4th	" " 1901—1905	...	...	531

BRONCHITIS.

The next disease that has escaped the attention of the vivisectors, and for which they have not discovered a serum or a prophylactic of

any kind, is bronchitis, and here again the Registrar-General's returns seem to indicate that it has been a felicitous thing for mankind that the vivisectors have hitherto overlooked this disease in their experiments. The figures for the average deaths per million persons living for the last twenty years in quinquennial periods are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	3126
2nd	" "	1891—1895	...	2074
3rd	" "	1896—1900	...	1763
4th	" "	1901—1905	...	1237

CONSUMPTION.

We next come to consumption, including Pulmonary Tuberculosis (tuberculosis phthisis) and phthisis (not otherwise defined). Here again, fortunately for mankind, the vivisectors have abandoned the hunt for a serum ever since the portentous exposure of Professor Koch's tuberculin in 1894. It has been dismissed from the claims of the vivisectors by their spokesman, Mr. Stephen Paget, who alludes to it thus: "Its failure was one of the world's tragedies" In the meantime, during the last twenty years, we have seen the spread all over the world of the fresh air treatment, which needs no vivisected animals to manifest its value. The records of Somerset House give the following death-rates per million persons living for the last twenty years in quinquennial periods:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	1635
2nd	" "	1891—1895	...	1462
3rd	" "	1896—1900	...	1323
4th	" "	1901—1905	...	1215

It would seem from these figures that it will be for the benefit of mankind if the vivisectors continue to leave the cure of this disease to means and methods wholly unconnected with their practice.

CONVULSIONS.

I next come to convulsions. This has escaped the attention of the vivisectors, and for the last twenty years the death-rate has gone steadily down. The figures for the quinquennial periods are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	770
2nd	" "	1891—1895	...	688
3rd	" "	1896—1900	...	580
4th	" "	1901—1905	...	462

Here again mankind is to be congratulated on the neglect of the vivisectors to apply themselves by their methods to the cure of this disease.

DROPSY.

Mr. Stephen Paget, in his "Experiments upon animals," makes no claim on behalf of the vivisectors for any discoveries in connection with this disease due to their investigations. It is fair, however, to record the fact that Sir Lauder Brunton, before the Royal Commission, did claim that benefits had accrued to the art of medicine in regard to this disease from vivisection. He, however, made no reference to any particular experiments which may have been in his mind when he made this claim, so it is impossible either to verify or refute this statement by reference to any record of actual experiments. The death-rates, as recorded by the Registrar-General, for the last twenty years, in quinquennial periods, are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	19'8
2nd	" "	1891—1895	...	13
3rd	" "	1896—1900	...	10'2
4th	" "	1901—1905	...	15

DYSENTERY.

I can find no reference to this disease either in Mr. Stephen Paget's book in praise of vivisection nor in the evidence of the vivisectors before the Royal Commission. The recorded death-rates at Somerset House show that in the absence of any interference from the vivisectors this disease has at least remained stationary, and has not shared the malignant ascent which seems to accompany treatment based upon vivisection.

The quinquennial figures for the twenty years down to 1905 inclusive are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	681
2nd	" "	1891—1895	...	651
3rd	" "	1896—1900	...	815
4th	" "	1901—1905	...	674

INFLUENZA.

This disease does not seem to have attacked the inhabitants of this country seriously before the year 1890, the death-rates for the preceding five years, from 1886 to 1890, being 3, 3, 2, 157. The quinquennial figures for the twenty years down to 1905 inclusive are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	33'6
2nd	" "	1891—1895	...	415
3rd	" "	1896—1900	...	308
4th	" "	1901—1905	...	191'6

Its gradual descent in fatality since its first arrival has fortunately not been interfered with by any efforts on the part of the vivisectors

to find a serum and inject it into patients, and it is to be hoped that they will continue their inattention to this disease in order that its decrease in mortality may continue uninterrupted.

HYDROPHOBIA.

Sir Lauder Brunton was asked before the Royal Commission the following question: "You satisfied yourself on that condition that "Pasteur's treatment saves lives?" to which he replied: "Absolutely." I have not the means at my disposal of investigating the death-rates from this disease in foreign countries, but two facts are indisputable: the first is that Pasteur Institutes in Paris and elsewhere have entirely failed to prevent people from dying from hydrophobia. The second is that in England, where there are no Pasteur Institutes, there is at present no hydrophobia.

MEASLES.

Happily for our children the vivisectors have never yet turned their attention to this disease: consequently, as might be expected, the death-rate has been permitted steadily to fall. The figures for the last twenty years in quinquennial periods are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	468
2nd	" " 1891—1895	...	...	407
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	...	421
4th	" " 1901—1905	...	...	326

MENINGITIS.

Here again the vivisectors have made no attempt by way of vivisection to meddle, and as a consequence we find the death-rates are going steadily down. The figures for the quinquennial periods for the last twenty years are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	316
2nd	" " 1891—1895	...	...	261
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	...	238
4th	" " 1901—1905	...	...	194

SCARLET FEVER.

Here again, fortunately for mankind, the vivisectors have not yet been permitted ingeniously to provoke this disease to be more fatal by discovering a serum and injecting it into mankind, and consequently the death-rate per million persons living has been going down during the last twenty years in an astonishingly rapid manner. The figures are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	241
2nd	" " 1891—1895	...	...	182
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	...	135
4th	" " 1901—1905	...	...	126

SMALLPOX.

I hold no brief on this occasion either for or against vaccination, as the establishment of the practice of vaccination when first instituted in this country had nothing whatever to do with vivisection, but curiosity has prompted me to examine with care the statistics at Somerset House, and they have yielded some very interesting results, and this is one of them:—I find that during the last two quinquennial periods if the deaths of those who succumbed from vaccination itself are added to the deaths from smallpox of those who had been vaccinated, they exceed the deaths of those who have died from smallpox and have not been vaccinated. The figures are for the two quinquennial periods:—

Vaccinated = .8 deaths;

From vaccination itself = 1 death;

which, put together, equal 1.8 deaths, and persons who have died from smallpox who have not been vaccinated = 1.4. In the last quinquennial period I find the figures are:—

Deaths from smallpox of vaccinated persons = 7.2;

Deaths from vaccination itself = 1;

which together make 8.2, and deaths from smallpox of unvaccinated persons = 7.4 only.

I present these figures for what they are worth, with my compliments to the Royal College of Physicians, on the one hand, and to the Anti-Vaccination Society on the other.

TYPHOID.

Professor Sir Almroth Wright, who is responsible for the invention of the serum which was injected into our soldiers destined for South Africa with the results now familiar to everybody, himself, on the 13th of March, 1906,* said that "he thought practitioners should "return serum treatment to the bacteriologists, and go on treating "patients without it." On the same occasion he also made the following illuminating remark:—"Manufacturing firms employed conscientious men to put certain things into horses, but what happened "afterwards in the horses was absolutely unknown to man." From this we may assume that the serum treatment for typhoid has, fortunately for mankind, been sent to the limbo of earthquake pills. The striking fall in the death-rate in the last quinquennial period seems to mark for mankind the happy abandonment of this malignant nostrum. The figures for the last twenty years are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	179
2nd	" " 1891—1895	...	...	174
3rd	" " 1896—1900	...	...	175
4th	" " 1901—1905	...	...	113

* See *British Medical Journal*, 24th March, 1906, p. 681.

WHOOPIING COUGH.

I have never come across any claims made by the vivisectors with respect to beneficial treatment of this disease based on their practices. The Registrar-General's returns show how deeply mankind is to be congratulated on the fact that vivisectors have not turned their attention to this disease. The figures for the last twenty years are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	444
2nd "	" 1891—1895	...	...	398
3rd "	" 1896—1900	...	...	359
4th "	" 1901—1905	...	...	300

All these figures, which can be verified by anyone capable of simple arithmetical exercises, show the insidious and malignant inroads the Black Art of Vivisection has made upon human lives wherever its familiars have succeeded in practising their sorceries and serums.

In the case of some diseases, such as cancer, it may be true that the recorded increase of mortality is not at present due to the direct injection of serums or nostrums into the hapless bodies of the unfortunate patients, though at any moment this direct assistance to the fatality of the disease may be begun by the bolder and more sinister of the magicians of the laboratories. Yet it is manifest that in the meanwhile no effort is spared by them to discredit time-tried melioratives, and to pour contempt upon the beneficent ministrations of clinical physicians, until faith is lost and skill depreciated to the deterioration of the true art of healing, and to the aggravation of the malignity of maladies.

The Registrar-General records his dispassionate facts, and proclaims to the world that wherever the hand of the vivisector is stretched out over a disease, there that disease increases its hold upon life, and hurries men faster to the tomb; and that wherever the sick ones of the earth have been tended beyond the reach of the vivisector, there more and more have the maladies that afflict mankind yielded to the ministrations of the kindly physician. It would seem, therefore, that the world would be the better if the vivisectors had never been born.

Held fast in a horrible fascination, these carvers and delvers into living dogs will not lift their eyes from the trough that holds their mangled victims, and perceive that the dreadful work with which they fill their days is repugnant to every moral and religious principle; nor will they permit themselves to recognise that every noble science, though it may tell us perhaps that Heaven is out of reach, yet assures us nevertheless that it is good to look up.

STEPHEN COLERIDGE.

CAN SCIENCE ABOLISH WAR?

JUDGED by its results, the most terrible weapon of war ever employed, and also the cheapest, was the sword in the hands of the old Roman infantry; to them the price of victory was always infinitesimal, to their enemy the cost was extermination. Moreover, of all weapons it made the least demand on the spirit of self-sacrifice and endurance of the individual fighter, for no one was called on to face death and annihilation in cold blood without making an effort at self-preservation. The British longbow followed next. Flashless, smokeless and noiseless it carried death to a distance of some four hundred yards, and men had to be trained to stand up to its punishment as a preliminary to the pleasure and excitement of physical conflict. The mental strain must have been even greater then than it is nowadays, for you could actually see your death coming at you without room to avoid it, and every man I have met, who in India, China, or elsewhere, has been called on to face visible projectiles, has assured me that it was a far more severe trial of courage than ordinary bullets can be.

Then the chemist interfered and gave us gunpowder, with noise, flash, smoke and recoil, and for two centuries the casualty lists became so confused that it is impossible to say how many fell to bullets or the sword in any particular engagement. By degrees the firearm asserted its supremacy in more definite form, and since the period of the Seven Years' War the casualties directly traceable to the sword, lance or bayonet have become quite negligible. Even in the days of the Peninsula it was hotly debated whether, as a fact, a single unwounded man had ever been killed by a direct thrust from the bayonet, though it was admitted that many a skull had been broken by the butt end of a musket. Since then the progress of invention has been most rapid, and we have arrived at firearms that are, in round figures, at least fifty times more efficient in man-killing power than those in use in the time of Napoleon. But the

casualties on the battlefield continue steadily to decrease. Thus at Marston Moor a man's life was only worth four hours purchase; at Waterloo, on the British side, about three days of eight hours each; at Mars la Tour, 16th August, 1870, breech-loaders being used on both sides, and rifled field artillery, four days of twelve hours; and at Liao-Yong and Mukden, not less than a fortnight. In no single modern instance has a single larger unit met with the same sudden and catastrophic penalty as that which overcame the Imperial Guard at Waterloo at the hands of the old British musket. Yet each fresh invention has been heralded by prophecies that its appalling deadliness must make war so terrible that no ruler would dare to unleash its horrors, and we have seen within the last ten years a proposal gravely discussed by plenipotentiaries of all nations to limit the further application of science to the battlefield with a view to diminishing its slaughter.

The fact is that every improvement in the range and rapidity of fire is immediately counteracted by the reluctance of the men exposed to it to come within its reach. Thus the farther the fear of danger keeps them asunder the greater becomes the consumption of ammunition and time necessary to inflict decisive losses. There have been no battles so short and decisive as those of Marston Moor and Rosbach since the fear of cold steel was practically banished from the battlefield.

On the other hand the longer the contest, made up of a series of more or less prolonged battles, the greater the sufferings of the non-combatant population; and the higher the standard of civilisation, the more rapidly do these sufferings begin to tell. Two centuries ago the 'conquered' populations merely changed masters, and in a seven years' cycle the economic consequences of defeat were practically obliterated: the poor remained poor, and the rich soon recovered their position. But since the French Revolution the consequences of defeat have become far more wide-reaching—and even in Russia, that most backward State economically—eighteen months of unsuccessful war have sufficed to bring about a revolution; whilst in France, in 1870, six months proved enough to occasion two catastrophes of a like kind; and the effect of these revolutions is almost continuous, the ruined rarely, if ever, retrieve their losses, and the trade on which their previous fortunes depended moves away and can seldom be attracted back to its original channels. The details of our sufferings, if the fortune of war should ever declare against us, it is impossible to predict; all that is quite certain is that our losses on the battlefield will be quite insignificant in comparison with the numbers that will succumb to famine and disease among the civil population. On the other hand, science has placed at the disposal of the people a power of inhibiting an outbreak of hostilities immeasurably greater than any that it ever

possessed before. No Government is strong enough nowadays to force a nation into war against the will of the majority, for the reason that the army, being the nation-in-arms, you cannot detail a minority to act as a firing party against the other and greater proportion of its numbers.

The outbreak of war carries with it as its necessary consequence a complete change of trade channels. Wealth is suddenly displaced from businesses remunerative only in peace time, to those called into increased activity by the demand for war material and special provisions of all kinds, and this sudden dislocation invariably brings hardship to the individual in its train. If the war is prolonged, then, as a rule, the trade of the victorious country develops extreme speculative activity; and enormous fortunes are rapidly made, often at the expense of the conquered enemy. The fate of the vanquished is of course precisely the reverse, and though "modern victors no longer sell their prisoners into captivity, or massacre them wholesale in cold blood, yet by the terms of the treaties of peace" they can, if they please, so completely cripple their adversary financially, that his power of competition in the world's markets may be wrecked for ever, and when the object of the war has been to destroy a competition, it would be contrary to common sense to forego this advantage once it has been gained. Whether it is possible to ruin a race of strong vitality and strong individuality as a whole may be open to question; but it seems an unshakable conclusion that by pressure of commercial restrictions, brought about by a crushing indemnity, such wholesale emigration of both capital and labour may be occasioned that the race may be driven to shift its centre of gravity to some more favourable location, provided that any such choice is open to it.

Consider, for instance, the consequence of an indemnity of 1000 millions sterling upon Great Britain, superimposed upon the direct and indirect costs of a war amounting to an equal sum, thus raising the National Debt to 2,800 millions. Then imagine a Chancellor of the Exchequer endeavouring to find a revenue to meet both this Debt charge and his ordinary Budget as well. Direct taxation certainly would not suffice, and the conqueror would take good care that direct taxation was not employed to his detriment at any rate. If we consider the exceedingly low average return on investments, the consequence of years of the unrestrained competition prevalent in England at present, the conclusion is inevitable that by far the larger proportion of our businesses would become insolvent, and every capitalist who had survived the war would make all haste to find a more favourable field—probably in Canada or Australia.

But could the working men follow him? Would Canada, Australia and South Africa suffice to absorb not less than five million workmen

* *Vide* Clausewitz on War.

with their wives and families? Would the Colonial labour leaders welcome such an influx of skilled hands—who of necessity would be the pick of the whole race, since no one would assist the unemployable to cross the ocean. My firm conviction is that if the calamity of defeat ever does overtake us, and we are defeated, the doom of the British Islands is sealed. Deprived of all our movable capital, and our shrewdest brains and hands (for the best will always find a market somewhere), and crushed by overwhelming taxation, the Government of the country will pass into the hands of the lowest type of demagogues, and the whole of our costly civilisation, which requires both ability and honesty to maintain it in working order, will disappear. The sanitation and water supply of the great cities will go first, diseases now only sporadic will then become endemic, and the population will be swept away wholesale until it is reduced to the bare limits which the agriculture and primitive fisheries round the coast will support—perhaps ten millions at the most.

The problem is beyond the unaided power of any one mind to grapple with, but it has been my constant pre-occupation for the past thirty years—ever since in fact I saw famine at close quarters in India; and it is my settled conviction that there is not a Bank, Insurance Office, a Municipality or Railway which could survive the consequences of National Defeat; and what that would mean to all classes of investors, I leave each man to follow up for himself.

But if things look dark for us, they seem to me at least equally black for our possible enemies should *they* go under. We should not, indeed, press so hardly upon them as to threaten the extermination of their trade—for that would be to kill the goose which lays the golden eggs, whereas to the foreigner we appear as but one of the many geese who would soon become more prolific if our share of the brains, honesty and capital (the essential food of successful production) were displaced to richer fields.

These business qualifications, which in England can only earn a bare four per cent. return, would produce from ten to twenty per cent. in newer countries, so that after a temporary depression Europe would be more than recouped for the loss of our direct transactions. It would simply mean to them the elimination of a somewhat expensive middleman between the producer and consumer. But my contention is that if it ever falls to our lot to fight a group of great Continental States to a finish, the appalling social upheaval which must result, before we could compel them to sue for peace will have already created conditions from which they will not rally for generations. They cannot follow the flag to other countries, and if capital, ability and labour are displaced, it is we, or at any rate our carrying trade ultimately, which must derive whatever advantage there is to be gained. If we recall the condition to which the pressure of our sea power, facilitated by the action of the Berlin decrees, had brought

all Europe at the close of the Napoleonic Wars, and contrast the economic forces at our control to-day, the conclusion is unavoidable. Defeat must entail social and economical annihilation to the vanquished; and one cannot conceive a responsible Ruler, or group of Rulers, accepting such a risk of his, or their, own free will.

Unfortunately for the cause of peace, it is equally impossible to conceive of their possessing any free will in the matter when the moment of decision arrives, for economic causes incessantly at work around us can, even without the assistance of arms, bring equal calamities upon us with far greater certainty though with less rapidity.

Suppose two great nations engaged in international trade competition, in which both instinctively feel themselves to be losing ground—not that this can ever be the case, but because the increased competition cuts wages and profits finer—the pessimists on each side fan the dissatisfaction of both by freely prophesying certain and immediate ruin. That ruin may intervene and be inevitable admits of no doubt; it has happened before, but the process is slow, and time is given for individuals to adapt themselves to the change of circumstances. But the people, through the disturbing lenses of their daily Press, see disaster staring them in the face and reason that things cannot go on as they are. "If we fight," they say, "we may win, but if we don't we shall certainly starve; of two evils let us then choose the one which holds out at least the chance of changing our intolerable lot: let us go to war."

To those of us who have thought this matter over and who realise what the inevitable first consequences of war, whether successful or not in the end, must undoubtedly be, the necessity for making any such choice may not appear so evident. After all prophecy is not an exact science as yet; all the secrets of science have not been disclosed, and it takes very little to change the current of any trade. The boring of a railway tunnel near Bradford threatens to destroy the supremacy of that town in the finest woollens; the re-discovery of a forgotten city in eastern Bengal threatens the Lancashire monopoly in cottons, and no doubt many other alterations are at hand, some good, some bad, according to the point of view from which they are seen.

The certain violent disruption of all commercial relations, internal and external, which war must bring in its train, seems an unmitigated evil when contrasted with the gradual adjustment of affairs always in progress around us. But the knowledge of what modern war really means is absolutely foreign to all European nations, for never in previous encounters has the network of commercial credit been so intricate or all-embracing as it has become during the last thirty years of peace. As matters now stand in Europe it seems to me

as absolutely inevitable that the increased commercial intercourse between nations must lead to a cycle of war—a real struggle for the survival of the fittest—as, but for the existence of law and the police (backed in the last resort by bayonets), breaches of the peace would follow unrestricted business competition between any two ordinary business firms. The more the scientific inventor tinkers with the problem, producing guns which aim at the destruction of combatants only, the wider he opens the flood gates to the tide, for, as above pointed out, these only tend to diminish the losses, and it is quite conceivable that war may soon become little if at all more dangerous than what we now class as the “dangerous trades”; and certainly it will always remain a more fascinating pursuit in the public estimation.

But suppose the inventor were to abandon this line and concentrate his attention on the wholesale destruction of material, in a manner, and on a scale, to bring home to even the most sluggish imagination the absolute certain consequences of hostilities—how would that alter the situation?

I merely offer the suggestion to be thought over. If, for instance, we were informed on unimpeachable authority that the certain consequence of an outbreak of war between any two great European powers would be the total destruction of all their principal cities, since the projectile weapons of either could sweep the territory of the other from end to end—would that argument suffice to restrain public opinion or would it not? Such a possibility is by no means so remote as it might at first appear, for already there is in existence a weapon, invented by Mr. Simpson (whose name is already well known in connection with his metallurgical researches and discoveries), which can impart, by the application of electricity, an initial velocity of 30,000 feet a second to projectiles of all dimensions which can be practically handled under war conditions, and on board ship, or in permanent defences, 2,000 lbs. weight lies fairly within these limits. What the ultimate range attainable with these initial velocities may prove to be experience only can decide, for we have no practical data to guide us in determining the resistance the projectiles will encounter in their passages through the air. As far as we have gone, *i.e.*, with velocities up to 2,500 feet a second, the resistance increases as the square of the velocity, and if this rule holds good at higher rates, then practically there is nothing to prevent these weapons—one can hardly call them “guns”—from throwing shells from London into Paris, or *vice versa*, at the rate of a few thousand a day, with consequences to the respective Governments concerned which those who have studied the “Psychology of Crowds” and their response to the stimulus of the sensational Press methods of the day can easily imagine.

Even though the complete realisation of this possibility may be

yet some years in coming, in the end it is unavoidable, because this new weapon possesses other qualities, viz., absence of recoil, smoke and flash, together with a cheapness of construction which no Government can possibly afford to overlook—and ours least of all, because its adoption would put a stop for generations to the senseless competition in battleship programmes which recent events have forced upon us.

Why this is so it will be interesting to examine. The principal reason why our battleships and warships generally are so expensive to build is the enormous structural strength it is necessary to give to the hulls, to enable them to resist the shock, and concussion, when firing their guns. Since these new weapons have neither recoil nor explosion, no special structural strength is needed for them at all, and hence any vessel that can float becomes potentially a fighting ship. Now should we become involved in a European war, the only thing which can be predicted with certainty is that after the first few weeks, or days, every battleship, indeed every warship, will either be at the bottom of the sea or in dock, and for the time being the sea will be free to all, falling ultimately to the Power which can extemporise fighting ships the most rapidly. The command of the sea, however, is life and death to us; hence, even if we agreed at some future Hague Conference to relinquish the advantages this extraordinary weapon must confer upon us, in face of a starving people, the agreement would be torn up and we should recognise the truth expressed by Clausewitz: "In war the use of force is absolute: to limit its application on grounds of philanthropy is to commit an absurdity"—which sums up in few words the whole of the lessons taught to Germany by Napoleon's tyranny.

Now as long as the use of this new weapon is confined to the sea—the question of extreme range is of minor importance—the fifteen miles or thereabouts already attainable suffice amply. But once the pressure of our sea power began to tell, our enemies would of necessity be compelled to seek the utmost extension of its destructive radius as an answer to our threat of starvation. "If you insist upon starving us we will destroy London, and as many other towns as are worth the expenditure of our shells"—and again our reply must be to proceed to the destruction of Paris. The result would then depend on which nation could stand up to the punishment with the least derangement of internal law and order; or rather which Government could trust its people the most implicitly. The answer to this question only the future can give, for though under quite normal conditions the reply may be obvious, a nation in a Great War is like a man in delirium, no one can forecast its actions. No sane body of men would have ventured on the risks lightly assumed by the Revolutionary Government during 1792-3; and history, we may remember, has a tendency to repeat itself.

The new factor, a recoilless gun capable of sending its projectiles through any armour afloat, or which can be made to float, turns the scale of war in our favour; for no pre-existing conditions of warfare since the days of the long-bow have afforded us such opportunities of developing the full fighting power of the individuals of our race. As the battleships settle to the bottom of the sea or crawl back to their docks, the coolness and tenacity of the man behind the gun assumes a higher value, and that this coolness and tenacity remain the leading characteristics of our people, the records of every shipwreck or mine disaster annually demonstrate. On land we may modify and restrain these qualities by ill-considered tactical methods and misunderstood experiences of other nations, but on the sea danger is the same for all, and there is not a merchant seaman of any nationality in the world who does not readily concede to the Anglo-Saxon the pride of place.

There remains only to be considered the influence this new weapon will exert on the future of the dirigible balloon and the aeroplane. The problem is too involved to be unravelled here in all its complexity, but this much seems worth saying: Though the new weapon will be far the most formidable danger airships will have to face, airships may prove to be the necessary complement of the new weapon, since only by their use can the full advantage of its accuracy be developed. Over the land, therefore, the command of the air will still have to be fought for. Over the sea, on the other hand, the advantage will rest, at any rate for some years to come, with the airships belonging to the fastest fleet, on condition that the latter has either adequate sea-room, or can choose its own time to attack; more than this it seems impossible to predict at present.

F. N. MAUDE.

MECHANISM AND LIFE

A STRANGE phenomenon in the growth of science is the alternation in the vogue of rival theories; and it has nowhere been more marked than in the domain of biology. During the latter half of the last century the "mechanical" or "physico-chemical" view of life laid claim to dogmatic orthodoxy; but in the last ten years the tide has changed. There are still many, indeed, who reluctantly admit the difficulties in the way of the proof of their mechanical theory, but express the fervent trust that our growing knowledge of physics and chemistry will overcome these difficulties, and give a full explanation of Life in terms of the laws of non-living things. But the majority of the biologists of the present generation are inclined rather to chaff these persons as the possessors of a "cheerful and optimistic temperament" than to share their pious aspirations.

I propose in this paper to survey the causes which gave rise to the two latest phases of thought on the subject.

The collapse of the older vitalistic school towards the end of the first half of the nineteenth century—the school which maintained, as modern vitalists do, but in a different way, that no complete explanation of the phenomena of living beings can be given in terms of the laws of non-living things—was, it would seem, largely due to the sudden increase in precision of our physical ideas, and to the general acceptance of the conception of the conservation of energy, as well as of matter. The peculiar behaviour of living beings had, down to that period, been referred to an abstract entity, called "Vital Force." When the physicists had limited the meaning of "force" by defining it as an "acceleration of mass," when the persistence of energy through all its transformations was recognised, and the intake and output of energy of the living organism were found to balance as well as those of any machine or apparatus whatever,

the term "Vital Force" lost its propriety, and had to be dropped. Indeed, it became obvious that the peculiarities of living beings could not be classed as forms of energy, force, or matter; and it was easy to disregard as mere lumber that quality which found no place in the symmetry of physics and chemistry, to ignore, as an intruder into the orderly laboratory, the presence that had no name to give to the custodian. A further encouragement to the anti-vitalist lay in the glorious achievements of the chemist who—despite all predictions to the contrary—was now producing by combination and separation so many of those "organic" substances which had hitherto been only found in or produced by living beings; while he failed to see that he himself was also a living being. Indeed, in the '70's the current belief among students of Physiology was that within a decade albumen and other proteids would be synthesised, and that by the end of the century protoplasm would also be manufactured, probably in a living state.

Again, the rise of the Descent Theory, mainly due to Charles Darwin's presentation of it, had put forth a scientific explanation of many biological problems that had received none theretofore. And religious prepossessions also had their influence. Many freethinkers assumed, quite absurdly, that the mechanical view was antagonistic to all theistic hypotheses, instead of imperatively requiring them as we shall see; and so it was welcomed by such men as Carl Vogt and Ernst Haeckel, the most brilliant and dogmatic of the number.

In England, at least, the vitalists of the period had a bad time, and a poor show; their opponents had the advantage of recognised position and the command of the public ear; they were incomparably the better writers; the taunt of theological prepossession was raised, not without reason, against the vitalists; and the protests of that inarticulately verbose genius, Lionel Beale, were overborne and swept out of sight by the brilliantly lucid dialectic of Thomas Henry Huxley. Thus the attitude of the accredited physiologists of the day appeared to their own students, and to the public at large, to be hostile to vitalism in any form or shape. I remember that at the Manchester meeting of the British Association in 1887, one speaker hinted at a vitalistic explanation. When he sat down a distinguished Professor of Physiology jumped up, and carried the meeting with him by quoting, without preface, Bret Harte's well-known lines:—

"Do I wake? Do I dream?

"Do I wander in doubt?

"Are things what they seem,

"Or is visions about?"

We must remember that the official physiologists of the time found their main work, as we shall see, in ascertaining with great precision the changes, physical or chemical, at the surfaces or at the extremities of organs. To increase the delicacy and accuracy of their observa-

tions, they worked as far as possible with isolated organs, which, as Samuel Butler pointed out in "Erewhon," have, indeed, the character of internal machines in relation to the organism as a whole. Unconsciously they were impelled to magnify their office, and to exaggerate the theoretical value of their results; they assumed that if more were known of the internal workings of living beings, they would all prove to be of the same character as those that lay in the territory they were so brilliantly exploring with the apparatus of the physicist and the chemist. Yet a little consideration might have made them hesitate. The processes of growth and repair are most essentially physiological; and into these their manipulations and records gave no insight. The narrowness of this official school is manifest to the world in the practical exclusion from its text books of the work done during the last two decades of the century on the physiological processes of reproduction and heredity, and in the astounding fact that all progress within this field has been achieved by biologists to whom the title of physiologists is not given. The reign of mechanistic views is coincident with the rise of this official school of physiologists; its decay is due to the enormous amount of broad physiological work done outside the bounds of their almost crystallised tradition. Yet we must remember that the most distinguished British teachers of the school were far from the extreme views of their disciples, just as Wilkes protested that he was not a Wilkesite. My own revered teacher, Michael Foster, said one day, when I was pointing out certain osmotic relations in connection with renal secretion: "My dear fellow, that isn't enough; you may be sure that the kidney cell gets rid of what it wants to." And Burdon-Sanderson said, when talking to me and Professor Ch. Richet in 1900: "The real meaning of life is adaptation," using the word evidently in the same sense as "self-regulation." If all the processes in a factory were kept strictly secret, we can imagine a checker at the gate insisting that all that went on inside was some modification of carting; and possibly he might convince an outsider of that strange doctrine, on the ground that "Bill is employed at the factory, and he ought to know." We can now see, therefore, that the apparent consensus of physiologists until recently against vitalism need not have an undue weight with the man in the street.

It is always well to have clear definitions before us, or at least clear indications of what we mean by the words we use. Many a controversy has had a verbal confusion at its base, on one side or on both, and this question is no exception. "Machine," "Mechanism," meant originally a contrivance, an arrangement by a living being. Both these words have come metaphorically to mean an arrangement, an assemblage of things standing in a causal relation to one another (in their widest sense, including purely psychical relations, such as

the "mechanism of memory"). It is obvious that the most outrageous vitalist, accepting the law of causality, would not reject this extension of "mechanical" explanation in the living world; and in this sense the term ceases to have any controversial value. I think that a fair definition of a machine* is a portion or aggregate of matter chosen, fashioned, or arranged by a living being to effect some transformation in the relations of matter, or of energy, or both. This change is the *object* or the *purpose* of the machine, of the mechanician who makes it, and in the making of the machine the purpose lies in the *future*.

"Mechanism," the more abstract term, is that arrangement in a machine concerned with its purpose or effect. Thus, while we should call a selected flint chip, no less than a steel knife, a "machine," any ornamentation on the latter would form no part of its "mechanism" as a knife. "Mechanics" is the science of machines, and has been restricted to include that dealing with the equilibrium and the movements of solids,—readily extended to those of liquids, so long as they do not change their state of aggregation. The wider science—dealing with the equilibrium, strains, vibrations, and movements, molecular and molar, of substances, so long as they change no more than their state of aggregation, solid, liquid, or gaseous—has received the name of "Physics." The science dealing with interchanges of composition is "Chemistry;" and the older name of "Mechanical School," applied to the antivitalists, has given way to that of "Physico-chemical."

Before passing on, we must examine another term which has been much used with little precision of meaning and much vagueness of implication. "Automaton," "automatic," which mean self-moving, were first applied to human or animal motions performed without conscious will or reason, or even against these. Later they were applied to machines requiring a minimum of manipulation during their work, and also to working models of animals, with internal machinery designed to execute motions like those of the original. These meanings survive to the present; we may cite two illustrations. We measure time at the present day by counting the oscillations of a suspended weight or of a coiled spring, and we know that such oscillations are gradually damped by friction, and soon cease: we make the *automatic* watch or clock by introducing a coiled spring or a wound-up weight with a train of wheels; thus the oscillations are at the same time maintained for a long period, and recorded by the hands instead of being separately counted. In these respects we have made our time-counters "automatic." Again, in the first steam-engines of Newcomen the alterations in the steam-cocks by which the motion of the piston was periodically reversed were made

*Though we distinguish the simplest forms of machines as "tools," it is impossible to except the latter from our definition.

by the hand of a boy in attendance. One boy, more playful or more ingenious than his mates, tied strings to various parts, and so made the reversals "automatic." The automatism of the machine is in every case the result of the planning, and has to be explained by future purpose, as well as by past manipulation. Thus we can differentiate machines from other non-living aggregates of matter by their purpose in the future, as well as by their history in the past. Compare a mountain talus, a river, a lake, with an embankment, a canal, a reservoir: science finds no account of the past action of a living organism, no hint of a future purpose, in the production of the three former; but both these have to be forthcoming for a full explanation of the three latter.

A machine is distinguished then from other non-living aggregates by its definite purpose: in other words, the purpose defines the machine. A sharp-edged flint becomes a machine when a man takes it up to cut or to strike fire, whatever may have been the antecedent cause of its sharp edge: it was, however, a machine from the outset when it was produced by a "knapper" who split the original nodule to obtain it. If there has been a recent tendency to overlook this keynote of the machine idea, it is easy to explain it by reflection on our mental growth. The young child has not enough experience of the history and behaviour of non-living beings to understand the "How"—the reference to their antecedents which is the sole scientific explanation of those that are not machines—his only anxiety is the "Why?" By and bye, as the child gains experience, he learns that for all occurrences that are not the actions, direct or indirect, of living beings, the "How" is a great deal easier to learn than the "Why"; and that for many of these things the "Why" is unattainable. Moreover, in many cases of machines, the "Why" is so obvious and so familiar that it ceases to be an object of consideration. Thus everyone is interested in the kinematic arrangement of the typewriter, the linkage of keys, bars, and types, by which the pressure of the fingers is converted into a definite character on the paper; but the "Why" explains itself, and is taken for granted. Yet what physico-chemical explanation, what geometric description of the characters would adequately explain the typewriter to the most intelligent of human beings, who, let us suppose, is a master of physics and chemistry, but has no conception of written speech? It is just this recoil from childish anthropomorphism, carried to an extreme, which explains, though it does not justify, the mechanistic attitude of men of science during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Accident may invent a machine; reflection will duplicate it. The late Prof. Morrison Watson told me that his parrot, while playing with a bit of stick which it had gnawed to a point, casually scratched his back with it, and evidently liked the sensation. Thereafter,

whenever he was given a bit of stick, he deliberately sharpened it first, and then used it as a scratch-back. The "Why" now determined the "How." If such a simple machine, a mere tool or implement, can receive its full explanation only by the admission of what the schoolmen termed the "final cause," how much more does purpose enter into the explanation of the complex physico-chemical relations of such a machine as a great electrical installation? Over and above the relations of forces, masses, chemical composition, etc., we must invoke the deliberate actions of intelligent beings foreseeing the future.

Seeing, then, that to explain machines we have to invoke the foresight of intelligent beings, the mechanical explanation of living beings demands for its completion the acceptance in full of Paley's "watch and design" argument, and the trespass across the boundaries of natural science into the domains of natural religion. And we saw at the outset that any wider definition of a "machine" will deprive the word of all controversial value.

It is easy to collect a few distinctions between machines and organisms. A machine requires to be set in place to perform its purpose; even if its purpose be locomotion it cannot direct itself without the intervention of an organism; it cannot, after completing one task, travel to a new site of operations. It may be so far automatic as to adapt itself to certain varying conditions of work, but the limits of this self-adjustment are always narrow in range and limited in character. It cannot compensate for the effects of wear and tear by taking up fresh material and depositing it in the worn parts, so as to restore their efficiency; nor can it form afresh parts lost or destroyed. It cannot accumulate material of its own kind so as to produce machines of its own type; nor can it divide into two or more machines like itself. A machine may, like an organism, have for its task the raising of energy to a higher type, and storing it up; but though both can only do this at the expense of the dissipation of other energy, the machine does not store up the energy within itself, but elsewhere. Thus the electric plant raises a portion of the energy derived from the combustion of coal to the form of the energy in the accumulators, while the rest of the energy of the coal is dissipated as heat at a low temperature; but the energy is transformed in the turbogenerator, and stored in the cells of the accumulator.*

"Automatic machines" are no less essentially machines: they have the same disabilities that we have already considered. If we try now to get round the difficulty by calling animals "conscious automata," we are using contradictory terms; indeed, the use of "automatism" in biology is so conducive to question-begging, or at best providing decent fig-leaves for the naked ignorance which it is the

* Professor A. E. Taylor, of Montreal, has insisted on the character of machines in his "*Elements of Metaphysics*." (London, 1903), page 236 f.

duty of science to remove, that it should be wholly abandoned. It is curious to note here again that automatism found its first great exponent in the orthodox Descartes, and its last in the agnostic Huxley.

In the negative characters of machines mentioned above, we have foreshadowed the characters that distinguish living organisms. Only the highest organisms can make complex machines, it is true; but the beaver's dam, the parrot's scratch-back, the nest of the bird or the insect, and even the cemented shell of the lowly Foraminifer are all included under our definition. Yet we cannot adduce the production of machines as an essential or universal character of the living. But all do at some period of their existence take into themselves substances altering their composition and combination, with the ultimate result that they increase their substance in every part thereby—a long periphrase for the simple statement that they grow. This process is termed "assimilation." This must be qualified for certain reproductive cells that owe their chief increase to the direct reception from the parent organism of chemical substances which for the time they only store; ultimately they digest these internal food-supplies, and grow and multiply at the expense of these stores.

Indeed, while part of the food taken up by the organism is utilised for present needs of work, repair and growth, a certain proportion is redeposited in reserve stores for the future needs of the organism itself, or for the nourishment of the reproductive cells or offspring, which are, as it were, parasites for some time after their formation. Owing to these reserved stores that exist in the organism, the provocation of a minute external change may enable it to effect an absolutely disproportionate amount of work by the liberation of some of the stored energy: the external change is called the "stimulus," the discharge of energy, whether thus disproportionate or not, the "response," and the capacity for response to stimulus "irritability." So comparable with this is the discharge of a projectile by the minute work of a trigger, or it may be the still minuter work of an electric spark liberating foot-tons of energy in a cannon, that organic response is termed *action à distance* (trigger action) by the French, and *Auslösung* (letting off) by the Germans.

On the whole, the organism shows a greed of energy and of matter, eventuating in the multiplication of its kind, quite unparalleled in the non-living world, as was shown in 1891 by Prof. John Joly in his brilliant essay, "The Abundance of Life." Reproduction is due to the geometrical difficulties in the way of unlimited growth through this efficient greed. For, as Herbert Spencer showed, if in a growing body the form be retained, the ratio of surface to mass decreases, until at length the organism can no longer fulfil its functions for want of adequate surface. To remedy this disparity—and here we see another indication of purpose—the organism reproduces or

multiplies. It may divide into two, each half developing to the form of the original, in the lowest types; it may branch indefinitely; it may divide unequally; it may shed small parts of itself, such as buds, or simple reproductive cells which, alone or after pairing, reproduce the behaviour of the parent (or it may be the grand-parent). The proportionate size of such reproductive cells to the organism they reproduce, and which has formed them, may be extremely minute—in man of the order of 1.5 : 1 million.

The utilisation of part of the food in replacement of waste and in repair is familiar to us all: this the organism effects by itself, and for itself—I had almost used the forbidden term “automatically.” It not infrequently happens that restoration goes beyond damage—repair is greater than wear; so that the organism is all the better for the strain on its working. Thus, what we may call *easy* fatigue of a muscle or group of muscles is followed by simple restoration; but if the fatigue be pushed to moderate distress, the restoration brings about increased growth, strength, and efficiency. No machine, however, is the better for such straining, and the more frequently it occurs, the more serious is the resulting damage.

Muscles are not alone endowed with this privilege: it is general in the organism. Bones contain systems of struts and stays to withstand the stresses to which they are exposed normally; if a broken bone sets askew, new systems are formed to replace those old ones that have lost their strength of position. Trees strengthen themselves by sending out their roots further on the side that affords the firmest anchorage against the uprooting tendency of the prevailing winds; and an unsupported sapling develops stronger roots than one that is stayed. Side by side with the power of repair is that of compensation for permanent impairment of a portion of the body, often due to a corresponding increase of efficiency or of growth elsewhere. For instance, when the respiratory capacity of one lung is destroyed by disease, the other lung gains the power of carrying on double work; and if the one kidney is removed the other kidney enlarges to meet the twofold task thrown on it.

Motile organisms travel actively to obtain their supplies; plants anchored by their roots in the soil send them out most freely in the directions where they will find rich soil and water. H. M. Jennings, the most successful observer of the lower motile organisms, finds that *even* the simplest of these, the amoeba, failing direct indications to guide it to food, seeks it by a method of trial and error, which may well be compared to the behaviour of a pointer “quartering” the fields in search of game. Herbert Spencer tried to show that these “conservative” actions were the necessary result of physico-chemical laws, but in most cases his analysis stops short at the lucid restatement of the problem to be solved. Thus in the matter of

reproduction by division, he gives the very valid reason we have cited for the limits of possible growth of organisms; but his account of the proximate causes of the actual division are inadequate or absent. In many cases, it is true, a cell usually divides across its longest diameter, a method which has a modicum of physical justification; but in the cambium (formative layer) of trees the division is parallel to the length, and rather in accordance with the future needs of the plant than with what we know of the existing physical conditions. To use Foster's words, the cell divides "as it wants to," or, rather, as the tree wants it to.

While all this must be well-known to the physiologists, they have rather busied themselves in the domain where the peculiarities of the living organism were less marked. They have worked at the surfaces or at the ends to investigate *resultant* physical and chemical effects; they have analysed the chemical substances discarded by the organism as waste, or obtained from its no longer living substance. But, as mentioned above, the *physiology of the organism as a whole*, the physiology of the cell, the physiology of the Protista (organisms which have the character of isolated cells), no less than embryology and heredity, have long lain outside the door of the physiological laboratory, and been fostered by outsiders. I may be excused, then, if I refer to an analysis that I have made of the normal reproduction by division of the cell—a study which, from the minuteness of the object, excludes the use of the apparatus of physical and chemical measurement. The processes may be distinguished into the following:—(1) Those known in the non-living world; (2) those which are known to occur elsewhere in the living organism, but which have as yet received no adequate physico-chemical explanation; (3) Mitokinetism, a strain-force, similar to, but almost certainly distinct from, electrostatic force; (4) processes that find no clear equivalent elsewhere. Moreover, the general *behaviour*, the orderly way in which the same end is in different cases reached from different starting points, and by different routes, is very characteristic of the living organism.

The chemical processes of the organism require special attention. They may be distinguished into two classes: (1) the grosser actions that go on in cavities like the alimentary canal and the blood-vessels; and (2) the local changes that go on within the living tissues and the cells themselves. The former are, I believe, all, without exception, *destructive*, or retrograde changes, breaking down complex into simple chemical compounds, with liberation of energy, mostly in the form of heat, *dissipative* changes: and these it is usually easy to repeat in our apparatus of glass, metal and caoutchouc, in our laboratory machines. But in class two we find, in addition, many constructive, *accumulative* changes, which have not yet been artificially repeated; and even among the destructive ones no chemist has produced those

chemical ferments, such as pepsine, trypsin, &c., which play so important a part in the destructive changes of the cell and of the large cavities themselves. Again, the chemist resorts constantly to isolation and to separation: his vessels are of material that acts as an insulator or barrier to soakage ("osmosis"), to electricity, and, if needed, to heat; he resorts to crystallisation, precipitation, filtration, evaporation, and congelation; he utilises temperatures ranging far above the 30-40° C of living beings, and solvents such as pure alcohol, petrol, benzol and ether, which are deadly to the organism.

Now the cell is composed of colloid substance saturated with solutions of electrolytes, pervious to electricity, moderately conducting to heat, and remaining at a uniform temperature such as outside the body will not suffice for the chemical transformations of the chemist, by which he synthesises organic substances.* Hence it is admitted that our knowledge of the chemical transformations of the organism is inadequate. But the optimistic mechanist consoles himself by proclaiming that our knowledge of the properties of colloids is incomplete. It is, however, far less incomplete than when this explanation was put forward by Haeckel, over thirty years ago; but the growth of our physico-chemical knowledge, immense as it has been in the interval, has not removed the difficulties I have mentioned; it has not advanced the growth of the physico-chemical school; but, on the contrary, has coincided with its ever-increasing unpopularity among biologists.

In embryology, the study of the evolution of the complex organism from a single cell, the morphological unit or equivalent of a single unit of the adult body offers remarkable examples of the peculiar characters of living organisms. The original cell has for its function to grow at the expense of its enclosed reserves, until it divides into two; and this process is repeated for some time without any marked differentiation, until there is an aggregate of cells which form in succession a rounded, mulberry-like heap, a hollow spherical aggregate, and a double-sac, like a lined skull-cap, the hollow being the primitive alimentary cavity. Only after these changes have taken place is there usually the beginning of differentiation of the cells among one another for the different tissues into which they are to be transformed. At the first division into two these are normally destined to give rise to the right and left halves of the body respectively. The second division specialises the front from the rear. But if at these early stages the embryo be violently shaken, the cells separate, and may develop, each "on its own," to form a complete animal, and not an incomplete one. So if one cell at an early stage be killed and the other or others be

* Much has been written of the molecular structure of living protoplasm; but it seems certain that living protoplasm is not a chemical substance, and therefore can have no molecular structure in the chemical sense of the word.

left together, the result will be a complete animal, save in so far as deformity may be introduced, by the mechanical hindrance due to the presence of the dead cell. Again, if a complete embryo at the stage of the hollow sphere or of the lined cap be cut into two, either half will develop into a complete animal, and that by direct differentiation—not by processes of repair and regeneration. The occurrence of such a division by some accident or by causes that completely escape us occurs—very rarely—in man, and gives rise to “identical twins.”*

It is interesting to note that Gakton has found in a number of cases that identical human twins, brought up under different conditions, have had grave diseases at the same age, and died at nearly the same time. I ascribe this to no mysterious telepathic agency, but to the power of the organism to go its own way and to reach its own end under widely different external conditions.

An instance of this persistent obstinacy of the organism is to be seen when for a short time, during the early stages of embryonic development, the “egg” is compressed, so as to lie in a flatland, where all the divisions must be vertical, and all the cells lie in a single plane. If the pressure be now removed, the cells group themselves so as to constitute a normal embryo, though the filiation of the cells of its different parts is wholly different from the normal arrangement. Thus, while we admit that development is according to causal laws, every step being conditioned by the antecedent ones, we cannot reach the threshold of complete understanding on purely necessitarian lines. Let us take a parallel case on our opponents’ own mechanical ground. An engine breaks down on a railway, and blocks one line completely and seriously. The superintendent of the line during the time of blocking will despatch all traffic both ways past the block over the free line, making temporary junctions and switches where such are needed; or he may even send the trains by another route. It is, I admit, possible to give an account of the course pursued in terms of necessitarianism only, each fact taking its place in a chain of proximate causes. But the future problem of getting as many trains to their destination as possible with a minimum of delay is never absent from the despatcher’s mind; and were he in such a condition as to be incapable of realising the future, these arrangements would be left undone. We know nothing of the mind of the embryo, or of the individual cell, nor even can we say that it has a mind; but we may safely say that the future is one of the determining factors of its behaviour under changed circumstances, and probably even

*Twins, generally, are due to simultaneous development in the uterus of distinct eggs, and they may be of opposite sexes; they are comparable to the brood of two or more that most animals throw in a single litter. “True” or “identical” twins appear to be formed as described above; they are always of the same sex, are singularly alike in form, feature and constitution, and are surrounded by a single caul. In French, they are distinguished from *jumeaux* as *biensons* from the conjectural Latin, *bisones*—‘doublets’ familiar to the readers of George Sand.

under normal conditions. To declare it inadmissible is to clap the telescope to one's blind eye.

This power of what we call metaphorically "side-tracking" is in the organism known as "self-regulation:" most apparent in the domain of embryology, but everywhere present, and including compensation, repair and strengthening. Despite the antagonistic theories and practices of different nations, races rarely die out. The *à priori* objections to compressing the skull or tight lacing are obvious to all; and yet the Flat-head Indians and the fine ladies of civilised nations continue their respective practices with a surprisingly small amount of harm—most disconcerting in the latter case to the dress-reformer—thanks to their vital powers of readjustment and compensation under widely different conditions.

It is, indeed, consoling to think that the best meant efforts of the faddist who carries theories based on inadequate premises to conclusions in practice that must needs be erroneous cannot do one tithe of the harm that would be done were our bodies, indeed, machines.

Thus the organism differs from a machine in its spontaneity and in its egotism, which may, however, be a racial and not a personal egotism, as in the case of the Protistic parent that loses its individuality in its offspring when it divides, or the insect-mother that dies in generation. The organism grows itself; it adapts itself for its own or its racial needs, unlike the machine that works for those of the mechanician, the material organism which has selfishly made it for its own ends. This was well pointed out by the late Samuel Butler,* to whose stimulating writings I owe a profound debt of gratitude.

To conclude: We may distinguish all aggregates of matter into three classes: (1) Organisms, which grow and store energy and matter for their needs and for those of their lineage, and which reproduce, and are self-regulated;

(2) Machines which are aggregates of matter not in continuity with organisms, and which are selected, constructed, or formed by an organism for the purposes of the organism itself or of its race;

(3) Things at large, which do not come into either category, and which are conditioned by their antecedents only.

We can no longer speak of "vital force." Professor Benjamin Moore has suggested the term "biotic" or "biological energy," which seems to me to be equally unavailable. If the transformations of energy were proved to be wholly due to material aggregation, we might speak of "vital arrangement." I think it better, however, not to go beyond the facts or to use terms connoting an unknown and assumed entity,

* Author of "Erewhon," and of "Life and Habit," "Unconscious Memory," &c. It is true that in some places he would seem to ignore the differences between organisms and machines, but it is easy to attach undue weight to his very seriously worded banter.

such as Ockham would have disallowed,* but to content ourselves with speaking of "vital behaviour."

For the preceding views I cannot claim more than their presentment in writing: they are those acted on implicitly in practice, and more or less consciously accepted in theory by the majority of working biologists (including psychologists) outside the physiological laboratory, and by a daily increasing proportion of those who work within its dignified portals, despite belated proclamations to the contrary.

MARCUS HARTOG

* "*Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem.*" Such an unnecessary entity, for instance, is the *Entelechia* of Hans Driesch, which connotes the striving of the organism for its ultimate weal.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

RAILWAYS AND REFORMS IN MACEDONIA.

THE Balkan tangle is being slowly unravelled, and the war rumours have in consequence quietly died away. From the first there was nothing to fight for. By the extension of a railway line calculated to open up trade and commerce, and tap the latent resources of the Peninsula, a well-wisher of the country, as Russia is, could not feel chronically aggrieved. Her contention, therefore, was not that the railway projected by Austria would be useless or baleful, but only that the time was ill-chosen to ask the Porte for the concession. And it certainly was. By appearing in the character of a suitor, Austria, as a prosecutor, was ruled out of court, and the Sultan was emboldened to reject the demand for judicial reform in Macedonia. Austria had set her own interests above the cause of the ill-starred people of Macedonia, and had stolen a march upon her fellow-worker. That was Russia's real grievance. The Balkan States viewed the matter from a different standpoint. Russia's attitude was a puzzle to them. They were painfully conscious that since the Müritzsteg programme was framed Russia had taken no measures to cultivate the friendship or promote the well-being of the Balkan Slavs. She had cast a spell over the Balkans, and kept things there in a state of immobility. And this inactivity was avowedly a concession to Austria-Hungary. Then all at once the discovery was made that the other party to the compact had construed her obligations less rigorously, and had improperly gained an advantage over Russia. Moreover, it was manifest to everyone that one political effect of the projected railway would be to weaken Russia's influence among Southern Slavs, not merely for a decade or during a reign, but permanently. For it connoted as complete a loss by the Tsardom of the protectorate over the Balkan Slavs as was the loss by France of the protectorate over Oriental Catholics. Moved by this

perspective, the Russian Press took alarm, and patriotic politicians thought they could descry the spectre of war looming in the distance. But it was only a mirage.

Much that was written on the subject by the Press of Russia and Austria belonged to the category of things that had better be left unsaid. For example, the likelihood of war with Turkey in the near future became one of the most popular themes of telegrams and leading articles. The circumstances that neither Power could afford to go to war, and that, even if it could, the question at issue could not be solved by the sword, were overlooked. One remarkably interesting thesis, however, was put forward by an esteemed friend of mine, who for years had been Juris-consult in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and is one of the most competent authorities in Europe on the Near Eastern problem in all its changing forms. A. A. Bashmakoff analysed carefully article 25 of the Berlin Treaty on the strength of which the Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Baron von Aehrenthal, obtained the Sandjak Railway concession, and he maintained and proved that the right which the article is believed to have conferred upon Austria-Hungary was not bestowed by that clause,—was never even contemplated by it. The clause in question states that "Austria-Hungary reserves to itself the right of having military and commercial routes" ("*des routes militaires et commerciales.*") Now the French word *route* does not mean a railway branch line, but only a carriage road. This contention is amply confirmed by referring to article 29 of the same Treaty, where it is laid down that in the new Montenegrin territory Austria-Hungary has the right to construct *une route et un chemin de fer*. From this it would follow that a "route" is different from a "railway," which latter is termed in article 29 a *chemin de fer*, and in article 38 *une ligne ferrée*. This contention cannot be gainsaid.

In the second place there is a serious geographical confusion in the Austrian line of argument. In article 25 it is a question of the Novibazar Sandjak "of the former Vilayet of Bosnia." Now the boundaries of the former Vilayet of Bosnia do not by any means coincide with the frontiers of the present Bosnia through which Austria-Hungary is about to extend the line. Consequently here, too, the basis of Baron von Aehrenthal's contention is swept away. Lastly, the words *au de la de Mitrovitsa* have been wrongly translated by "in the direction beyond Mitrovitsa," which gives to Austria a much wider field of action than is really warranted by the phrase, which in French means only the urban line of the city of Mitrovitsa. In a word, according to the thesis of my friend, A. A. Bashmakoff, which is now accepted by experienced diplomatists, the entire action of Baron von Aehrenthal was based on three misunderstandings, not one of which would appear to have been noticed by the Porte. But the Russian Foreign Office, declining to avail itself of mere formal

pleas, took the common-sense view of the matter. If a railway built with Austrian money will benefit the Slavs of the Balkans, it behoves the natural protector of those Slavs to welcome it, to support it, if possible, to outdo it. And that is the line which M. Izvolsky has taken in the Circular Note forwarded to the Tsar's diplomatic representatives abroad. Russia, he explained, will welcome every new undertaking from which real progress may be expected for the Balkan Slavs, irrespective of its origin. Austria has inaugurated the economic movement by setting to work on the Mitrovitsa line. Now let other States follow her example. Italy has already begun, Serbia is making ready—and all three Powers can reckon on Russia's support. There can be little doubt that this is the proper way to play the difficult diplomatic game.

THE MURZSTEG PROGRAMME.

But if Baron von Aehrenthal's separate action will not lead to war, it does not follow that it has had little or no influence upon the Near Eastern question. On the contrary, it is hardly too much to affirm that it marks an epoch. One of its results will be the definite abandonment of the Murzsteg Programme, which the Foreign Secretary, however he may desire to uphold it, cannot now cling to for long. This plan of campaign was agreed upon by the two States in 1903, for the purpose of obliging the Porte to grant certain reforms to the people of Macedonia. In exerting this pressure, Russia and Austria-Hungary were the delegates of Europe. To many it seemed an unnatural partnership at the time; to almost everybody it appears a hopeless arrangement to-day. Although nearly five years have elapsed since it was signed, only two points of the programme have been realised—a gendarmerie officered by Europeans and a Finance Commission, consisting of representatives of the great Powers. And to the population of Macedonia these two reforms have brought no surcease of sorrow. Lord Lansdowne's criticism of the Programme in 1905 was sagacious and correct: the work of the Finance Commission would be bootless, he argued, unless it were invested with administrative and executive powers, and unless the number of Ottoman troops in Macedonia and its surroundings were reduced to what was absolutely required for the maintenance of internal order. He would also have had the supreme command of the military there conferred upon the Inspector-General, with whom the Finance Commission would co-operate.

And time has borne out Lord Lansdowne's forecast. The forty-seven gendarmerie officers, who are the backbone of that service, can accomplish little, because they have no right to give orders to the gendarmes or to have the troops called out when necessary. Hence murderous gangs may, and do, move about the country unmolested

by the gendarmes, whose officers are compelled to be mere onlookers. All they can do is to draw up veracious reports, take tell-tale photographs, and send them to their respective Governments. But the net result is *nil*. Order is as far off to-day as it was in 1903. Since the reforms have been introduced no less than 10,000 persons have been murdered in Macedonia. There is no justice, no retribution, no deterrent. Before the tribunals Christians and Mohammedans are treated very differently, the latter being highly privileged, the former being denied elementary rights. This acceptance of persons is upheld by the Sultan, who, therefore, never will grant the judicial reforms demanded unless he be compelled. Voluntarily, Abdul Hamid will not allow the testimony of a Christian witness against a Mohammedan to weigh as much as the evidence of a Moslem given against a Christian. *Quod licet Jovi non licet bovi*. Now so long as the gendarmes are not authorised to check the advance of gangs of murderers and incendiaries, who spread terror among the peaceful population, and so long as the courts are not encouraged to punish evil-doers to whom heinous crimes are brought home, no reform can possibly better the lot of the wretched people whose cause is being ostentatiously taken up by so many representatives of humanity and apostles of liberty.

INFLUENCE OF AUSTRIA'S ACTION ON ITALIAN POLICY.

Austria's eagerness to build the Sandjak Railway had a proximate cause and a favourable occasion. Russia's weakness was her opportunity, and her motive was the necessity of reaching the sea. It seemed indispensable to get to the sea because of the possibility of the Adriatic becoming a *mare clausum*. Suppose, for instance, Italy managed to bar the Straits of Otranto; Austria's outlet by water would be completely shut off and her dependence upon Germany's routes and railways would be abject and galling. To be dependent upon your rival in trade and industry for the conveyance of your wares and products to the very markets for which both of you are competing is assuredly humiliating, and might become ruinous. It is the case of Servia and Bulgaria, who therefore look to Austria's goodwill for the maintenance of their commerce, and have to pay for it heavily. In order to guarantee herself against a similar fate, Austria felt compelled to push forward south and south-eastwards. And the earnestness with which she has gone about it makes it clear that she regards the exclusion of Italy from the eastern shore of the Adriatic as a vital issue, a question of life and death.

To Austria's Balkan policy, which is carefully adjusted to this end, that of Italy runs directly counter. And naturally. For the Government of King Victor Emmanuel III. cherishes the hope, nay, the

firm conviction, that Montenegro-Albania will one day become a semi-independent State under Italy's Protectorate, or else the Albanian seaboard will in some other way come under the sway of the House of Savoy. Italy sets so much store by this acquisition that her Albanian interests have come to be looked upon as vital. Albania is the third selected and last possible colony for Italy. Owing to the dilatoriness or hesitancy of her statesmen, she allowed the opportunity of annexing Tunis to slip by unutilised, and then she proved too weak to hold Abyssinia. King Victor Emmanuel's marriage with Princess Helena of Montenegro brought a Slav element into Italian foreign policy, and was taken to confer upon Italy a cultural mission in the Balkans like that of Russia. Hence the important part occupied since then by Albania in the cares and preoccupations of Italian statesmen. Albania is treated almost like Sicily, in some respects much better. Schools have been opened at Italy's expense in Skutari, the Albanian tongue has been studied and cultivated, Albanian books printed in Italian, and, above all else, a truly national Albanian spirit, in lieu of the narrow clannishness, degenerating into tribal strife, which hitherto prevailed among Albanians, has been preached by Italian agents everywhere. To many Albanians even at present their tribe is the State and the Church combined, while vendetta and hospitality are the alpha and omega of their moral and religious code. Italian influence, however, is gradually changing all that, and striving, not without success, to make the Albanians capable and desirous of that autonomy which Italy regards as the best solution of this part of the Balkan problem.

Writing on this subject in the year 1903,* I ventured to express regret that the Italian Government lacked the courage of its opinions and the energy demanded by the magnitude of its interests, allowing excellent schools in Prevesa, Vallona and Durazzo to be suppressed, and refusing encouragement to the project of a railway from Durazzo to Monastir. Since then, however, much has changed, and Albania is now universally regarded in the Peninsula as well within Italy's sphere of interests. Hence, an Italian railway has been begun from the little port of Antivari—an hour's distance from the Adriatic—to Virbazar, on the northern Montenegrin side of Lake Skutari, whence it is to be extended to Cetinje. Now the real value to Italy of this line will be its utility as a means of tapping the resources of Albania. In virtue of the Treaty of Berlin, Austria, many hold, might have vetoed this line on Montenegrin territory, but forwent this right. Personally, I question this interpretation of §29. But that she will ever permit the extension of this railway through Albania is incredible. And this is the point where, despite Signor Tittoni's recent speech, the vital interests of Austria and Italy clash. Austria will not suffer the eastern shore of the Adriatic to come under

* "Contemporary Review," April, 1903.

Italy's real or virtual sway. Indeed, Turkey is the only Power that can possess it without serious detriment to the Habsburg Monarchy. And when Turkey's possessions come to be distributed among her heirs, Austria is prepared to lay claim to the eastern shore and, if needs be, to enforce that claim at all hazards. Italy, on the other hand, regards herself as heir to the possession of the further shore of the Adriatic, and bases her claim on more solid historic grounds than Austria. Moreover, Albania commands the entrance to the Adriatic, which has often been described as one of the lungs through which Italy breathes and lives. A military Power like Austria, once in possession of the gulfs and ports of the coast, would be mistress of the Adriatic, and could checkmate Italy for ever.

These two sets of interests are seemingly irreconcilable. So far as one can now see, neither party can give way. Hitherto the Austro-Russian understanding and the respect for the *status quo* which it inspired kept the antagonism of the two States in abeyance. But Baron von Aehrenthal's move in the Sandjak of Novibazar has ushered in a new period of sharp competition, the violent culmination of which may be far off or near at hand. It is possible that the contingencies which can be reckoned with at present will be discussed and perhaps even provided for soon after the meeting of Kings Edward and Victor Emmanuel at Venice. In any case, I am disposed to regard the fate of Albania and the command of the east coast of the Adriatic as one of the most difficult and dangerous of all the questions which constitute the New Eastern Problem.

AUSTRIA'S COMMERCIAL PREPONDERANCE IN THE BALKANS.

In the brilliant discourse on Russia's foreign policy delivered by M. Izvolsky in the Duma on the 11th March, the Foreign Secretary explained the line of action taken by his predecessors as the result of great historic events. They bowed to necessity, having no choice. What that plea, if extended to Russia's policy in the Near East, probably means is that the Mühlstein Programme was necessary at the time. Perhaps it was a necessity. But if so, the fate that made it inevitable was unpropitious. For it has deprived Russia not only of the prestige which she once enjoyed in the Balkan Peninsula, but also of the start over Austria which she had there until 1903. Whether she will ever recover the advantageous position which she then occupied may well be doubted. Certainly it can only be, if at all, as the outcome of a series of brilliant diplomatic moves, favoured by such propitious circumstances as army reform and financial betterment. To begin with, Austria-Hungary has already won economic preponderance in the markets of Servia and Bulgaria; and political friendship often goes hand in hand with close commercial relations.

Austrian business men are characterised by push and perseverance, whereas Russians lack both those qualities, and some others more elementary still. During the last twenty years Austria's exports to Bulgaria have increased by nearly 300 per cent. Many of the wares thus bought by the Bulgarians could also be obtained from Russia, such, for example, as cotton and woollen stuffs, metal manufactured goods, petroleum, etc. Yet, strange to say, Russia occupies almost the lowest position among all the States that supply the Bulgarian markets with goods. Of the Servian nation, too, Austria-Hungary is the purveyor in chief, whereas Russia's share of the trade is hardly worth mention; the former country takes 86 per cent. of Servian produce, and sells in return 72 per cent. of the needs of King Peter's subjects. Russia, on the other hand, stands eighth in order among the purveyors of Servia, and the last of all among the purchasers of Servia's produce.

This commercial closeness of Austria to the Balkan Slavs is the cardinal fact of the situation. It cannot be reasoned away. Sentiment is as powerless against it as would be the sounding of trumpets against the strongholds of Posen. In all probability one of its practical corollaries will be an Austro-Servian Zollverein.

ARMY REFORM IN RUSSIA.

When Russia actually possesses the two conditions indispensable to a great Power—well-trained men and ready money—she may be able, if still willing, to unravel some of the international tissues which are now being woven without her help and against her will. Until then she must brook much that she would gladly withstand, and do it with a good grace. Since the Treaty of Berlin she has lived and thriven largely on prestige. Nations took her at her own valuation, and accepted her ruling even when it was gall and wormwood to them. But now that is past. The battle of Tsushima, the revolt of the fleet and the disaffection of a part of the army broke the spell, and at present the tendency abroad is rather to underrate Russia's might than to magnify it unduly. Nor is it only Germany or Austria who thinks slightly of Russia's military strength; even Sweden and Turkey show from time to time that the mention of the Tsardom in any and every connection calls forth their critical rather than their admiring faculty.

And, unhappily, there are plausible grounds for this disparaging attitude. It is no secret that the army is still waiting for real reform. Every foreign State is aware that the Russian officer of the line is miserably paid, wretchedly looked after, badly educated, and needlessly exposed to powerful temptation on the part of revolutionary and other anti-monarchical organisations. Patriotic officers occupying responsible posts assure me that in many important military districts

—in Siberia, for instance—the material condition of the troops is deplorable. One of them told me that when speaking with the Tsar recently he longed for a chance of uttering a few words about the all-important topic that concerned alike the monarch and the nation. But his opinion not being asked, he lacked the courage to broach the subject. “I am sure,” he said, “the Emperor would have the evils which are notorious remedied. For he is eager to ascertain the facts, and quick to take action whenever the efficiency of the army is at stake. And this is a case in point.” “Yes, but even the Tsar cannot create money,” I objected, “and money is the alpha and omega of all such reform as you have in mind.” “Not so,” he answered. “Money would certainly be helpful, and is desirable, but not indispensable. Besides, if large sums were needed for the purpose, and could not be raised, the practical conclusion to draw would be that for the moment at least an army less numerous and more efficient would be best suited to the needs of the Empire. Suppose, for argument’s sake, that this were so. Well, would it not be better for us to possess a well-trained, well-fed, well-clad, patriotic army, consisting of only two-thirds of the troops we have to-day? How much easier it would then be to add to its numbers, with the certitude that the new recruits would soon be quite assimilated by the efficient troops already under arms. But for that we need, as the first condition, unity of will, singleness of purpose, coherence of system. And it is useless to look for these qualities until the Tsar himself has taken the matter in hand. And this will not be until his eyes are opened on the subject. How I wish he had questioned me!”

EDUCATION OF THE RUSSIAN OFFICER.

The army intelligence department—the only service that can be used as a test in peace time—is very badly off for information in consequence of the conditions that prevail. Take Manchuria as an illustration. The Russians are wholly ignorant of what goes on in those districts of that province which are under Japanese influence. Their consuls, who are supposed to keep a watchful look out there, recently hired a few Chinamen as spies at salaries of thirty pounds sterling a year! The Chinese succumbed—almost without an attempt at resistance—to the temptation of secretly accepting higher wages from the Japanese on condition that they would communicate to the Russians information of a kind calculated to mislead them. Truth compels one to say that some of the Chinese officials may be loyal enough to their Russian employers; but, even so, they are practically useless because of their crass ignorance of military matters. For what is urgently wanted is information about military movements.

In these districts a thorough knowledge of Japanese would prove

most helpful, and as Russians do not possess it, it was resolved that a class of interpreters should be formed capable of reading and speaking that tongue thoroughly. But how was it done? In Kwan-chentzi an ensign on the retired list was charged with the training of twenty-seven Cossacks of the consular guard. For this purpose he received ten pounds sterling a month for three months. He began by securing the services of a Japanese teacher, who asked and was promised six pounds a month. At the end of eight weeks, however, the teacher disappeared; it is believed because he had not received the promised pay, and also because he had learned from the Russians all that he wanted to ascertain. That the bulk of the officers are inadequately educated is, unfortunately, too well known to need proof. How lacking they are in those branches of knowledge which in other countries are deemed to be elementary, has only recently been published to the world at large. The discovery was made in this way. A new rule was issued a short time ago prescribing written as well as oral examinations for all those officers who came forward as candidates for the Military Academy. It was meant as a rough test. To answer questions *viva voce* is easy to the man with a retentive memory, even though he be a person of no judgment. But to write a readable essay is a feat which calls into play certain mental gifts, the want of which would, in most cases, argue incapacity for the work which students of the Military Academy are expected to perform. Hence the new regulation—one of the very few symptoms manifested since the war of a desire to do something for the army. In March, 1907, then, these written examinations were held for the first time. But the results were deplorable, according to the military organ, *Rasvedchik*, which states that: 1. The officers examined possess but slender notions of any of the subjects in which they are supposed to be well versed. 2. Their general intellectual equipment is slight. 3. They are distinguished by inability to think and to judge. 4. They are further characterised by incapacity to set forth their ideas in writing, briefly, clearly, and intelligibly. 5. They are distinguished by ignorance of grammar in the proper sense of the word.

Such is the verdict of the General Staff. It may be correct or the reverse, but it ought never to have been published *urbi et orbi*, were it only because it casts a slur on the Russian army. These illustrations are instructive because they are typical. Other tales more interesting still might, if narrated, defeat my main object, which is to draw the careful attention of the Russian Government to the pressing needs of the army upon which the Empire rests. Therefore they shall be withheld. Foreign States are thoroughly well informed about almost everything that goes on in the Russian army. And in particular they are acquainted with its weak points. But in at least one respect, I am glad to say, several of them are mistaken:

they believe that a much larger section of the officers and the men are disaffected than is really the case. What happened to the navy is not likely to take place in the army. True, revolutionary propaganda is untiring, ingenious and suasive. But the results it has scored are very much less than is commonly believed; and at the present moment they are dwindling perceptibly away, in face of the determined resistance made by the orderly elements in the army and in the country. This, therefore, is the most favourable moment for army reform, which ought to be tackled with thoroughness, and carried out with all the energy and perseverance of which a patriotic cabinet is capable. Russia sorely needs peace abroad and peace at home, and for this reason she requires a powerful and trustworthy army. The immediate need of a formidable navy is less evident.

DOES RUSSIA NEED A FORMIDABLE NAVY?

The rock on which the Duma was expected to split was the credit demanded by the Government for the reconstruction of the navy. According to the Marine Ministry, Russia needs a sea force worthy of her vast army, and equal to the arduous tasks which a war with Japan or Germany would certainly impose upon it. In case of hostilities between Germany and Russia, for example, the German North Sea Squadron would speedily arrive in the Baltic through the Kiel Canal, and unless Russia were ready with a very efficient squadron, well handled by its commander, would render that sea a *mare clausum*. On the other hand, in a war with Japan, the most telling method of defence—attack—would have to be wholly eliminated from Russia's plan of campaign for lack of a formidable fleet, formidable by the number and quality of the battleships and by the discipline of the men. And this defect would render the most brilliant land campaign indecisive. For these reasons the Crown is anxious to give the Empire an adequate number of powerful battleships with the least delay possible. The bulk of the deputies, on the other hand, look askance on the scheme. Some of them refuse to countenance the expenditure of a large sum by a department which is said to be one of the least trustworthy in all Russia. Others feel and express their mistrust not only of the Admiralty and Marine Ministry, but also of Russian shipbuilding works, which, they contend, are not in a condition to give good value for the money or to do any kind of first-class work. Others, again, draw their objection to the scheme from the nation's impecuniosity. There is not money enough available. If the necessary sum could be raised, they would willingly spend it in ships. But it is not to be had. Another and influential section of the deputies refuse to allot hundreds of millions of roubles to the construction of battleships before the naval schools have been reformed, the Ministry

and Admiralty have been purged, and the army has been reorganised and rendered fit for latter-day warfare.

To an outsider, viewing things Russian in perspective, it will seem clear that a powerful navy is indispensable to a first-class Power like Russia. If Germany, with an insignificant strip of seaboard to defend, aims at possessing a navy as powerful as that of Great Britain, Russia, whose seaboard is 28,500 miles long, cannot well remain satisfied with the remnants of a navy that once was strong in numbers and in prestige. She must become once more as powerful on sea as is Germany or Japan if she is to hold her own with her present rivals and her future foes. And no Marine Minister worth his salt could do otherwise than impress upon the Duma the need of supplying this pressing want.

On the other hand, however, the fact cannot be blinked that this is but one of many requirements, all of which are at least equally pressing. Among the others is the reorganisation of the army, which is now in a deplorable state. And this cannot be postponed as a matter of less account than the rebuilding of the navy. In truth it is much more urgent. Then there is the construction of the proposed Amoor Railway—a scheme the realisation of which, strategists affirm, cannot be delayed without grave disadvantages, which may in war-time become calamities. And these are but two of many pressing wants. Now it behoves the Cabinet to approach the study of all these isolated questions from the standpoint of the statesman and the Finance Minister, and to ask what sums can be disposed of without weakening Russia's credit, and in what order provision had best be made for the various needs of the Empire.

From this point of view the first question to suggest itself would be this: is the strength, which a number of Dreadnought battleships would undoubtedly confer, worth having if its corollary be national bankruptcy? As money is the nerve of war, would not the loss of credit render the Empire as weak as the want of a powerful navy? And as it would also put a spoke in the wheel of the reform movement, and stay the work of progress, the net loss to the nation would be much greater than any partial gain. To this objection it is no answer to say that Russia's resources are inexhaustible. One may admit that her potential wealth is enormous without weakening the force of the argument for economy. As yet the riches lie buried in the ground, whereas what impatient creditors clamour for is current coin, and the amount needed will exceed Russia's capacity of paying if the Amoor Railway, the rebuilding of the navy and the reorganisation of the army be undertaken simultaneously. For it would not be enough to possess a squadron in the Baltic which should also do duty in the Pacific. If Russia is to be a sea power able to cope with Germany or Japan, she must possess one squadron in the Baltic, another in the Pacific and a third in the Black Sea. And the cost of

the battleships necessary to make up these squadrons would, were there no other objection to the scheme, be prohibitive.

On these grounds the Duma may decline to sanction the vote demanded by the Minister without exposing itself to the slightest risk of dissolution, seeing that so little has as yet been done for education.

EDUCATION IS A PRESSING NEED OF THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE.

Elementary instruction is one of the most pressing needs of the Russian people, especially since they have been allowed to have a voice in the government of their country. The bulk of the nation is truly benighted. The story told by statistics on the subject is most depressing. The official data for the year 1903—the most recent available—have been studied by members of the leading political party in the Duma. In that year the exact number of the population—so far as exactitude in such a matter can be attained—was 144,184,000, and among these there were only 26,558,000 who could read or write. Out of every thousand individuals the average number who could read or write differed largely according to the provinces, as the following table will show:—

	Males.	Females.
Baltic Provinces	775	779
Finland	700	650
Vistula basin	342	268
European Russia	300	130
Siberia	192	51
Caucasus	182	60
Central Asia	79	22

The yearly outlay of the State for popular instruction was but 11 copecks, or 2¾d. a head! If we add to this mite the sums furnished by cities, *zemstvos* and communities for educational purposes, the amount increases to 41 copecks, or 10¼d. How insignificant even this expenditure really is may be gathered from a comparison with the educational budget of other countries, thus:—

	s.	d.
Japan spends annually	1	1½
Sweden and Norway	2	9¼
France	3	5
Great Britain	4	11
Switzerland	5	0¾
Germany	5	1¼
United States	10	1
New Zealand	11	11½

Consequently Russia is behind the whole cultured world. Even China is much better off in that respect, because it has no inhabitants

who are wholly illiterate. It has been calculated that there are in Russia 13,250,000 children between the ages of eight and twelve who would need 265,042 schools if the average school accommodated 50 children. Taking that as a basis, and putting the salary of the teacher at 360 roubles, or £37 10s., and £6 5s. for religious instruction, the amount payable in salaries alone would amount to 103,366,000 roubles, and the upkeep of the schools ought to cost about 182,021,000 roubles, so that altogether 300,000,000 roubles is a moderate estimate of what should be expended annually on elementary education. Now, as a matter of fact, the Ministry of Public Instruction disposes of no more than 9,114,000 roubles, all told.

One great difficulty which the Government will have to surmount is the finding of qualified masters and mistresses, pedagogues who will not make instruction a channel for social and political theories of a subversive character. And that is one of the most arduous tasks that any Government could set itself, because the number of such teachers is very limited. That, however, is another question. What I have wished to point out is the urgent need of educating the people and the extreme difficulty of finding money for elementary schools as well as for other cultural requirements.

THE BALTIC UNDERSTANDING AT A STANDSTILL.

The negotiations into which Russia, Germany, Sweden and Denmark, as Baltic States, entered some time ago with a view to maintaining the present territorial integrity of each of them, have made little headway. Although they have not been actually broken off, they are almost at a standstill. It has been surmised that the idea was first suggested by Germany, who was desirous of creating a pendant to the declaration of the Mediterranean Powers, in which she had had no part. It seemed so easy to arrange a soothing parallel. But the two cases are not in all respects alike. The Mediterranean States were really content to keep their territorial relations to each other unchanged; consequently the declarations were drafted readily and promulgated willingly. With the political communities of the Baltic it was different. They are not all satisfied with things as they are; hence the *status* must first be changed before it can be declared unchangeable. And as there is a conflict of views among the Powers respecting the proposed modifications, the negotiations have come to a deadlock.

The subject matter of dispute is the Aland Archipelago, a group of granite islands situated at the mouth of the Gulf of Bothnia, between Sweden and Finland. Strategically they are most valuable; but in other respects they are almost worthless. Between them and the Swedish coast the Strait is but twenty-three and a half miles across so that a fast cruiser could reach Stockholm from the nearest part of the Archipelago in a little over two hours. The islands belong to Russia, and she exercised full sovereign rights over them down to the

close of the Crimean War. Thus in 1829 she fortified her position there, and later on built forts at Bomarsund, which were captured and razed by the allied English and French squadrons in November, 1854. In March, 1856, a convention was signed by Russia, England and France, by which the Tsar declared "that the Aland Islands "shall not be fortified, and that no naval or military establishment "shall be erected there." The reason of this stipulation was the fear entertained by the allied Powers that Russia would expand territorially unless a barrier of this nature were raised against her advance. For the Aland Archipelago is the key to the Gulfs of Bothnia and Finland, and if Russia had a naval base there she would virtually command Sweden's five hundred miles of coast on the Gulf of Bothnia, would keep Stockholm in fear and trembling, and would dominate two-thirds of the Baltic. That is the chief reason why Sweden is so anxious that the Aland Islands shall continue as they are. Another consideration is this: If Germany or England were at war with Russia, and Russia possessed a naval base in the Archipelago, the enemy would need a base in the Baltic, and, finding none anywhere except on the west coast, in one of the Swedish ports, would trespass on Swedish territory, and make use of this. Sweden, therefore, in order to hinder this violation of her neutrality in war time, would be obliged at present to set about fortifying all the weak points along her coast line, and to spend large sums in this unproductive work. If, on the other hand, things remained as they now are, and Russia were at war with Germany, the German squadron would proceed to capture the Aland Islands, in order to threaten the Russian army in Finland, as well as Cronstadt, Petersburg, Riga and the Baltic Provinces. Thus the Swedish coast would be left inviolate. These are telling arguments, and Sweden's fears are certain to be understood by all and shared by many.

RUSSIA'S VIEW OF THE BALTIC PROBLEM.

Russia, however, has also a case, and this is how her spokesmen put it. For generations the two countries, Sweden and Russia, have lived on good neighbourly terms, and nothing has occurred to trouble their friendship. Consequently there is a strong presumption that in the future, as in the past, they will continue to live in amity, especially as their interests do not clash anywhere. But if Sweden fears to acquiesce in Russia's resumption of full sovereign rights over the islands, Russia fears to waive any of those rights, and not only for dignity's sake but also for the very reason that Sweden alleges. If Russia be at war with Britain or with Germany, her enemy will naturally make for the Aland Archipelago and there endeavour to establish a temporary base of operations, because the islands at the neck of the Gulf of Bothnia are on the line of least resistance, and will be easily captured.

Another of the pleas of irresponsible Russian advocates seems to me wholly untenable. It is this. The Convention respecting the Aland Islands, which was signed by Tsar Alexander II. in 1856, has, they say, lapsed, in consequence of the dissolution of the Swedo-Norwegian Union. Now this contention seems to assume that the undertaking not to fortify the islands was given to the Union, and therefore Sweden alone cannot insist upon its observance. Historical facts, however, do not bear out this assumption. The text of the Convention runs thus: "His Majesty, the Russian Emperor, deferring to a desire expressed to him by her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and the Emperor of the French, declares that the Aland Islands shall not be fortified, and that no naval or military establishment shall be created there." Consequently Russia's obligation is to Great Britain and France, not to the Swedo-Norwegian Union. The Convention was not signed by Sweden, and if it be abrogated, as Russians hope it will, Sweden's consent need not be asked to the change.

Russia's responsible representatives speak a different language. They maintain that the question has been wrongly stated. The Swedish Press writes of "Russia's claim to create a naval base in the Aland Archipelago," whereas no such claim has been advanced, no such intention expressed or entertained. Russia merely shrinks from confirming a stipulation which is antiquated and humiliating, and which also hinders her from putting an end to the illegal importation of arms and ammunition for the use of revolutionists and terrorists in the Empire. She has never raised the question of fortifying the islands; nay, she has not yet raised the question of abrogating the Convention of 1856; still less has she declared that the Convention lapsed with the dissolution of the Swedo-Norwegian Union. All that she has done is this: to consent conditionally to a project for maintaining the *status quo* in the Baltic, which would be more welcome to Sweden than such a guarantee for her neutrality as Norway has received. She is willing to make the necessary declaration, and to give Sweden assurances which would relieve her of anxiety. But she is not prepared to pay for permission to do this favour to Sweden; she is not ready to enter into any new obligation. At present Russia is bound by the Convention of 1856 to Great Britain and to France, but not to Sweden. The two former States may agree to release her to-day or to-morrow on the ground that the restriction is not in harmony with the present international situation. Why should she now bind herself to Sweden, who would never loose her from the promise, because Sweden will always be afraid of seeing her capital city and her coast menaced by a Russian naval base in the Aland Archipelago? Is it reasonable to expect Russia voluntarily to impose upon herself a fresh and lasting obligation to Sweden for the purpose of rendering her a service? Russia has merely given a negative answer to this question, without raising, still less trenching on, any other.

All that Russia now says is this : "I am minded to guarantee Sweden's territorial integrity, but not to perpetuate the curtailment of my own. I am bound to France and England not to exercise full rights of sovereignty over the Aland Islands. I recognise the fact, and respect the treaty, although I made it after those two Powers had worsted me in war. It was a humiliating stipulation, and I think of it unwillingly. But I cannot brook the idea that Sweden should summon me to do the hateful transaction over again, binding myself this time to her, and solely because I am ready to help her."

Such is the language used by the more responsible representatives of Russia's interests, the more authorised interpreters of her aims. They affirm that nobody harbours the design of fortifying the Aland Islands, but they add that it is undignified to have France and England play the part of Russia's keepers there. Russia, they go on to say, will give the most categorical oral assurances to the effect that the Archipelago will remain as it is. "Why not give us written assurances?" ask the Swedes. "Because neither you nor Germany were parties to the Aland Islands Convention, and I cannot acknowledge your claim to become parties to it *post factum*. I am here to guarantee your territorial integrity, nor to forego rights which, so far as you are concerned, I still possess." And here the matter rests. On the one hand, Russia, it may be assumed, will not give way on the question thus formulated; and, on the other hand, Sweden may ultimately break off the negotiations for a joint declaration of the Baltic Powers, and conclude a special treaty on the subject with Germany.

THE IMPERIAL EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS.

Germany has, as usual, been in the foreground of contemporary history this month, but probably with less justification than heretofore. It certainly seems a pity that the Kaiser's private letter to Lord Tweedmouth was ever made the subject of public discussion. A policy of pinpricks is always mischievous, and the very worst that was ever said or believed of the Kaiser's epistle would not have warranted the excitement which it caused in Great Britain, or the short-lived indignation against Wilhelm II. which it aroused in the breasts of some patriotic and estimable political writers. Let us imagine the worst. Suppose the letter was written for the sole purpose of influencing Lord Tweedmouth; what then? So long as there was no undue influence, there is nothing that a great nation can reasonably object to. Questions of good taste and personal dignity have nothing in common with international politics. Any and every personal friend of the First Lord of the Admiralty may send him private letters combating his political opinions, and if he can dislodge him from his position, and make a convert of him, well and good. In constitutional monarchies the King may not influence his Ministers unduly. But he may discuss matters with them as fully

as possible, and if he succeeds in convincing or persuading them to abandon their convictions and espouse his views, neither he nor they have done anything reprehensible. For Ministers, like less exalted people, must draw their notions of public policy from the sources that are accessible to them, and whether one of these is the book of a professor, the article of a leader writer, or the private letter or the brilliant conversation of a clever monarch, is immaterial. Once the public official has adopted the opinion, it is his own, and he alone is responsible for it to the State whose servant he is. If public opinion were to forbid monarchs to correspond with those statesmen of foreign countries with whom they happen to be on terms of friendship, there is no adequate reason why it should not go further, and prohibit them from lunching, or dining, or holding any intercourse with them except in the presence of witnesses. Some years ago one of our most eminent statesmen had a conversation with the Kaiser, which led to his delivering a very telling speech in favour of close friendship with Germany. The result of that speech was a public snub administered to Great Britain by Prince von Bulow in the Reichstag. But all the blame was very properly laid upon the shoulders of the British statesman, despite the very extenuating circumstances which he might have alleged.

POLES VERSUS SLAVS IN PRUSSIA.

The Polish Expropriation Bill and the lurid light that radiates from that upon various domains of home and foreign politics have with much greater reason kept Germany in evidence of late. For the anti-Polish legislation means that in the kingdom ruled by Wilhelm II. Slavs and Germans can no longer live together in peace. One of the two must disappear by assimilation or emigration; and the Prussian Houses of Parliament are resolved that it shall be the Poles. In those parts of Prussia which originally belonged to the Slavs the population is increasing more rapidly than is that of Germany proper. Directly to forbid this by legislation would be a new, startling, and undesirable departure; therefore the lawgiver is going to work circuitously. And this is how he reasons. The population would not grow so fast if large families had not the land to fall back upon. The soil supports large numbers of people who, were they in cities, would be forced to emigrate. If the land were in German hands the Polish population might be successfully weeded out. Now all that is needed in order to attain this object is to pass the Polish Expropriation Bill.

And the Bill was duly passed by the Lower Prussian Chamber. A Special Committee of the Upper House, however, modified it so considerably that the Government refused to accept it in that shape, and appealed to the members to adopt the measure as it had passed the Lower House. The Opposition was numerous and strong. Leading Conservatives denounced the proposal as subversive of tradition.

stability and property. It was Socialistic, they urged, and established a precedent which might be abused to-morrow by a Socialistic Chamber, to the detriment of the nation. Some speakers pointed out that a policy of this kind is mischievous instead of helpful, because it can attain its end only if it be expanded into a grandiose struggle for the annihilation of the Poles. Moreover, the hated Slavs will not become less numerous and less prolific because they are dispossessed of the land. And nobody can seriously believe that they will grow less dangerous. The Polish problem in Prussia is not a land question. In fact, it is the landowners among the Poles who are willing to make terms with the Germans and live with them in peace. The classes which are uncompromising are the peasants and the burghers.

THE GERMAN PEOPLE THINKS AND FEELS, BUT THE GOVERNMENT ACTS.

But the Government argued only for the purpose of convincing the House. Itself was deaf to all considerations, political, economical, statistical. To the axiom that there ought in a great realm to be room enough for all the racial elements of the population, the Government answered that Germany would become great only when all its ethnic elements were welded together in one nation. When the Poles reminded the Cabinet that they had many times shed their blood fighting against the enemies of their second fatherland, the Government affirmed that nations never abandon their craving for independence, and that the Poles must therefore be denationalised. In answer to the objection that landless Poles will become dangerous domestic enemies, the Ministers declared that the Poles have always been Prussia's enemies, and that deprived of their land, they will become less formidable. Many speakers pointed to the parity between the Poles in Prussia and the Germans of the Baltic Provinces in Russia or the Saxons in Transylvania, and gave timid expression to the fear that one day the Russian or the Magyar State might do unto Germany as Germany was doing to Poland. But the reply to this was that it behoved no great nation to tremble or grow disquieted at the frowning of foreign peoples. When opponents of the Bill laid stress on the failure of similar experiments which the Government has been making since 1895, as evidenced by the fact that during the eleven years ending in 1906 the Poles had acquired from Germans 2,500,000 acres more than the number bought by the Germans from the Poles, the champions of the measure replied that expropriation was not a repetition of the experiment that had failed, but a new departure, and one that could not but succeed. In a word, the members of both legislatures seem to have been summoned to pass the Bill, not to discuss it.

And they passed it by a large, an unexpectedly large, majority. All objections, fears, misgivings, doubts were suddenly waived, and the voice of the Government hearkened to. Docility was the charac-

teristic of the nation's representatives. Even the Upper House, whose Committee had attenuated the Bill until the Minister disavowed it, ended by accepting it. And the numbers were 143 votes for it and 11 against it. This is one of the most significant circumstances throughout the debates. For, according to the German Press, in particular the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, the great majority of the German people, the Centre, the Socialists, the Freethinkers, and by far the largest section of thinking people in Germany, are, and were, strongly opposed to the Bill. Yet the Government had but to demand that it be incorporated in the Statute Book, and the request was granted forthwith. This is an object-lesson which ought not to be overlooked by those optimistic political writers among us who hold that if we are on friendly terms with the German nation, the German Government will be powerless to make mischief between the two States, even if it would. As in the days of the great Fritz, the rulers may allow the nation to write and say what it likes so long as they do what they think best. One of the most odious and unjustifiable measures ever discussed by a chamber of highly-cultured law-givers is swiftly passed into law against the better judgment of Press, bar, gentry, political parties, and people, solely because the Government makes the demand. It is not easy to believe, without some adequate proof, that in the case of a misunderstanding between this country and Germany the nation at large would take the side of Great Britain, and refuse to be guided by its own Government. At all events, the point is perhaps worth considering. Of course, neither this nor any other supposition would justify the Press or the Government of Great Britain in neglecting any legitimate means of fostering goodwill between the two peoples. Many a time have two rival nations—Germany and Russia are examples—gone on for years preparing for war against each other without ever having struck a blow.

IS THE EVICTION OF THE POLES A MILITARY MEASURE?

The re-grouping of European Powers is still going on apace, with scarcely any conscious effort, almost spontaneously. That Baron von Aehrenthal's railway project accelerated the process is manifest. But that Prince von Bülow's Polish Expropriation Bill should have been one of the results of it is by no means so clear. And yet this view is held not only in Russia, but in Austria, and in circles, too, which are in constant touch with the Government. As opinions of this character are forces for good or for evil, it will not be amiss to unfold the theory. Considerations drawn—it is said—solely from the sphere of foreign politics moved the Berlin Government to have recourse to a measure so unjust, a precedent so dangerous. At a series of military councils, presided over by the Kaiser, the possibility was considered of a war between Russia allied with Great Britain, and Germany.

allied with Austria. The co-operation of the British fleet would, it was pointed out, render possible a military descent in the rear of Königsberg and the loss of East Prussia, which would be the loss of Germany's base for an advance against the Baltic Provinces and St. Petersburg. Now, in most of the military operations which such a war would entail, the dispositions, friendly or hostile, of the population would undoubtedly play a noteworthy part. Hence the desirability of colonising West Prussia, Posen and East Prussia with Germans, and getting rid of the hostile Poles. The expropriation of Polish landowners is, therefore, only one link in a long chain of measures contemplated for the purpose of delivering the German army from the danger which a hostile Polish population would present. Whether these considerations really weighed with the Prussian Government I am unable to say, but I know that the story is believed by numerous individuals whose influence is widespread, and whose action will be swayed by this belief.

REVOLUTIONISTS WITHOUT A REVOLUTION.

In Russia it is now admitted on all hands that the revolution is quelled—at least for the time being—and that its suppression has not been followed by the abrogation of any of the concessions made by the Emperor in October, 1905. And the nation begins to breathe freely in consequence. But if the revolution is dead, revolutionists are still alive and active. The police, on the other hand, despite the reorganisation already begun, is not yet equal to the task of coping with them. Much has been accomplished in the way of improving the police service, but much more remains to be done. They scored a brilliant success a couple of weeks ago, when they got wind of a widely-spread plot against the lives of the Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolayevich, the Minister of Justice, and certain other prominent public men. The point of departure for the police was the arrest of a gendarme named Bogdanoff, who had gone over to the enemy. In his possession were found tell-tale documents which led to the arrest of over sixty persons. But the chief conspirators were still at large at the hour fixed for the crime, and if either the Grand Duke or the Minister of Justice had ventured out, he would have been killed on the spot. Happily they were warned to stay indoors. One of the conspirators, a Russian revolutionary student, had palmed himself off as an Italian journalist, and had received a ticket to frequent the Council of the Empire, where he might, had he been patient, have assassinated any Minister without let or hindrance.

The fanaticism of these terrorists is unparalleled in the annals of political crime. Their endurance reminds one of that of Fenimore Cooper's Red Indians. The other day one of their number, who was confined in the Yalta prison, burned himself to death with petroleum, and underwent excruciating agonies in silence. But among the police, too, there are heroes quite as numerous, and just as dauntless,

who look death in the face and never flinch. A numerous force of such men properly organised would rescue the Empire from chaos. But the progress made is slow, and before that feat has been accomplished the nation may be startled by crimes which would differ little from national calamities. One of the principal factors in the struggle against Red Terror is public opinion. And it must be confessed that public opinion in Russia needs guidance. The ideas of justice and equity which prevail in the Tsardom are peculiar. Crime is generally confounded with misfortune, and criminals of all kinds and grades are deemed to be not more guilty, but more unlucky than their fellows. It would be almost impossible for any Russian Cabinet to get ordinary tribunals to apply the law against bombists, even if taken red-handed. The trial in Austrian Galicia of a Russian lady revolutionist, which came to an end on 17th February, is intensely interesting as an illustration of what would take place in Russia if the ordinary law courts there were allowed to take cognisance of such crimes.

NOT GUILTY!

The scene was the court house of Vadovitz. In the dock stood a pretty young lady, elegantly attired in a black velvet blouse, surmounted by a snow-white collar. Opposite to her were the judges; on one side sat the jury. It seemed a quiet, pleasant sort of gathering, everybody looking cheerful. Yet there were judges, and lawyers, and an indictment, which charged the fair prisoner at the bar with a premeditated and resolute attempt to kill General Scalon, the Governor-General of Warsaw, by throwing three bombs at him as he drove along the street in his carriage. The lady heard the indictment unmoved, and in reply to the question "guilty or not guilty," said quietly that the facts alleged were quite true, but that in the forum of her conscience they did not constitute a crime; therefore she would plead "not guilty." After the opening speech of the counsel for the Crown, the prisoner told the interesting tale of her life. Born in the Province of Minsk in 1886, she was educated in one of the best boarding schools in Warsaw. When she was just turned twenty—in January, 1906—chance threw her together with a distant relative, who was a member of the Polish Socialistic Party. Through him she came in contact with other revolutionists, and very soon she conceived a powerful sympathy with their aims and objects. In July she repaired to Warsaw, sought admission to the revolutionary society, and was received on condition that she would carry out any orders given to her by the organisation so long as they did not clash with her ethical principles.

As Governor-General, Scalon was just then extirpating the revolutionary organisation root and branch, the party deemed it desirable to assassinate him. Accordingly Miss Kraghelska and a lady friend of hers, believing the sentence to be just, thought they would like to execute it, and their offer was gratefully accepted. But it was easier

said than done, because the Governor-General seldom quitted the Belvedere Palace. How could he be enticed outside? That was the great difficulty; but the party ingeniously surmounted it. One of the members donned the regimentals of a military officer, and assaulted the German Vice-Consul with his fists. The Vice-Consul complained, a diplomatic incident resulted, and the Governor-General felt it his duty to call on him and tender his apologies. All this was foreseen and provided for by the revolutionists. The party hired a suite of rooms on the Natolinska Street, almost opposite the Vice-Consul's dwelling, and instructed Miss Kraghelska to take possession of it, together with her lady friend. On the 15th August, three days before the fatal day, a member of the organisation gave Miss Kraghelska four neat packets that looked for all the world like boxes of sweets. Each one contained a bomb of enormously destructive force, two made of melanite and two of dynamite. On the 17th the lady was informed that the Governor-General would pay the visit of expiation on the morrow, and that she was expected to do her duty. And certainly she and her friend did their best. Sitting on the balcony, they patiently waited and watched for General Scalon, who did not arrive until half-past four in the afternoon. Miss Kraghelska had three bombs for the victim, while her friend held the fourth. The General drove up and entered the house. The lady conspirators suppressed their nervousness, and continued to wait during his interview with the German. At last he came out and entered his carriage. The coachman flicked his whip, and the horses started. The carriage drew near and nearer. It was level with the balcony. Miss Kraghelska threw her first bomb; the explosion was terrific; she flung the second, then the third, and looked. The carriage seemed to be still moving. Then her friend aimed her explosive. The whole street seemed to quiver, but the carriage still rolled onwards and out of sight. The fair bombist then donned a wig, changed certain articles of attire, and sallied forth into the street. The police arrested her on suspicion, but let her free a few minutes later. Her appearance was in her favour. She then took a cab, and, having said good-bye to her friend, went home. After that she spent some days in Warsaw, visited other Russian cities, and finally went to Cracow. Having later on paid a visit to Italy and Switzerland, Miss Kraghelska returned to Cracow, married an art painter there named Dobrodzitsky, and last September was arrested on the demand of the Russian authorities, and sent for trial.

Madame Dobrodzitsky having admitted all this, added that she had deliberately thrown the bombs with intent to kill, but that the act resolved upon by the revolutionary flying column was done for the purpose of winning independence for Poland and a constitution for Russia. Thereupon the jury brought in a verdict of "not guilty," and the lady returned to her home.

E. J. DILLON.

AFFAIRS IN TRANSITION.

HABET populus Romanus ad quos gubernacula rei publicæ deferat. The country is not lacking in men to place at the helm of State, yet a sense of heavy loss must hang over the Liberal party at the moment of its parting with the man who led it through the wilderness to its victory. It is impossible to define in a word the relation which Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman had established with the Liberal party and with the country, but we come nearest to it if we say that his fortitude seemed to be his commanding quality. Those of us who saw him in the black years remember how entirely unmoved he was by the storms that raged about him. There were moments when he would cheerfully have yielded the thankless post which he filled if there had been another man whom the party preferred, but he would not be driven one inch from the path that he had chosen by the invective of opponents or the criticism of friends. There was something perverse in the chance which had thrown a man, who by nature was all geniality and good humour, into this raging controversy, but in it his bravery and steadiness were beyond praise. He was implored to "set himself right with the public," and to explain that he didn't mean what he couldn't have meant, but he smiled indulgently and held his peace. But newspapers might misinterpret him if they chose; that was their affair, he had his own life to live. Nothing served him better than this entire lack of calculation in dealing with the public. It meant a rare kind of simplicity of character which gradually but surely made its impression. In this respect, though his temperament was warmer, he resembled the late Lord Salisbury more than any other statesman of recent times. Democrat and anti-Democrat, they both acted on the principle that the public should come to them, rather than that they should go to the public. Sir Henry had no illusions about the strength of the feeling against him during the early part of the Boer War. He went through the election of 1900

with his usual dogged philosophy, expecting the majority against him to be anything up to 150. He would not in any case have yielded an inch of ground where his convictions were at stake, but he was always quite sceptical of improving the position by shifting his ground. Either, he seemed to argue, the popular mood would change, in which case he would be in a stronger position for having held on his unpopular course, or it would not change, in which case he would never form a Government at all. In neither case was anything to be gained by yielding to an opinion which, while it lasted, would keep his opponents in power, and when it went would pass altogether. I am not suggesting that Sir Henry ever put it to himself in this precise form; but this undoubtedly was the pith of his philosophy of the party system. He believed in his party, and he did not believe in any of the half-way houses or cross-bench attitudes which are so tempting a refuge in times of adversity. And he was, from that point of view, the necessary man for the Liberal Opposition during those days. It is difficult, with the overwhelming triumph of 1906 in our minds, to remember what the past was from 1900 to 1903. One eminent man after another had laid down the task of leading the Liberal party as equally thankless and hopeless; the disastrous khaki election had seemed to make its exclusion from power a settled fact of our politics; worse than all, the differences about its policy and doctrine threatened to destroy the foundations of its belief. It was for at least some months a serious question whether there would be any Liberal party to face the next election. Some men talked of a new centre party; others were for cutting their connection with authority, and working on independent and irregular lines. During all this time Sir Henry stood firm "for the old faith," as he kept saying—the man of faith against the intellectuals who doubted and questioned. If anything roused him to strenuous opposition it was the suggestion that the tradition should be broken and the "slate cleaned." I rather think he will stand out in history as one of the men who, at a critical moment, have saved the party system; and the change of opinion in his favour may almost be dated from the time when the public began to realise the extreme importance of the service he was rendering. The British people love the two-party system, and the statesman who most earns their respect is the statesman who sticks to his party in bad times.

The subsequent course of events was entirely in his favour. One after another the issues which impatient people had buried prematurely came surprisingly to life. Mr. Balfour's Education Bill, his Licensing Bill and the finance of his Government flung defiance at the old Liberalism, and once more the battle was joined on economy, religious equality, and public rights against vested interests. Then in due time came Mr. Chamberlain's challenge to Free Trade. Sir Henry, it was clear, had been more than right in predicting that the

old entrenchments would have to be defended, as well as new ground conquered, and a Liberal party, true to its tradition, became the need of the hour. From this time onward the circumstances were as favourable to him as they had hitherto been the reverse. His stubborn character and simple and direct method of action were brought into sharp relief against Mr. Balfour's brilliant sophistications, and as the public tired of the substitutes and evasions which the Conservative leader had employed to prolong the Parliament, they turned with increasing respect to the plain-dealing leader of Opposition.

And yet one would give a wholly false impression if, in speaking of the straightforwardness and simplicity of his character, one seemed to imply that Sir Henry lacked any of the gifts and graces of the men counted clever. He was not only a very able man, but he was also a very accomplished and gifted man. His speeches were admirable in their literary form, he was swift and ready in repartee, he had a mind stored with good things. If he stood before the public as a homely man, it was not because he lacked culture, but because his instinct for the simpler human relations was by so much his dominant quality. He made no claims; he took prosperity and adversity with the same equal mind, he was entirely without resentment. I think it may be said that his career was creditable alike to him and to the public. It shows the value in this country of the upright civic qualities, and it affords a shining example of the power of character and courage to overcome prejudice.

* * *

It is always the fate of a new Prime Minister to be compared with his predecessor to his disadvantage. Every Liberal leader since 1894 has been reminded of his grievous disqualifications compared with Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Asquith must expect to be told that he lacks the qualities which enabled Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman to subdue the passions and rivalries of his "heterogeneous party." That is already being said in quarters where the wish is father to the thought. Of course there are obvious differences in temperament and mental attitude between the two men, and it may very well be that Mr. Asquith will at first appeal less to the sentiment and more to the intellect of the House of Commons than his predecessor. But the idea that he is a cold, hard man, who works with the precision of a legal or logical machine, is, I believe, a myth that will quickly be dispelled. Not thus is he known to his friends, and not thus has he appeared to the House of Commons during the early weeks of this session, when his brilliant performance of all the duties of a Parliamentary leader placed his succession beyond doubt or cavil. It is not for nothing that he is peculiarly associated with the one Bill introduced this year which the more timid of Ministerialists consider to be the most Quixotic and perilous of the Government's adventures.

We have been warned so often of the subtle changes which come over a man when he occupies the high place of Prime Minister that we may be cautious about predicting Mr. Asquith's future. Bagehot and others said confidently in the fifties that though Mr. Gladstone had every other grace and accomplishment that adorn human nature, he lacked the special qualities which were needed for a leader of men. Mr. Asquith is three years younger than was Mr. Gladstone when he first became Prime Minister, and though he has not the supreme opportunity which Mr. Gladstone had in 1868 of coming in with a new Parliament on a flowing tide, he has a situation in front of him which ought exactly to fit the qualities with which he is credited. The first impetus of the new Parliament has passed; there are signs of reaction in the country, and they are interpreted in opposite senses by men of different temperaments; important Bills have followed each other with such rapidity that the points of controversy have temporarily become confused and entangled. Light rather than heat is the need of the moment, and the leader who can simplify and concentrate is the leader who is needed. The party, if it is wise, will let Mr. Asquith use his own capacity in his own way, and if he remembers his old habit of putting his foot down, that also will not be amiss or unwelcome. As the Parliament runs its course, a choice will have to be made of the more important things, and the less important will have to be sacrificed to them. If its energies are dissipated over the whole field, it will risk losing everything and be reduced to ploughing the sands, and perhaps be compelled to cut short its own existence.

Let me endeavour, as briefly as I can, to sum up some of the more obvious factors in the present situation. First, there is the state of opinion in the country. Up to the end of last year there was no sign of any reaction worth considering. In many elections in industrial centres the swing of opinion seemed actually to be towards the left, the Labour Party and the Socialists gaining one or two notable triumphs by denouncing the slow and cautious methods of the Government. Here, perhaps, was the germ of a reaction. Mr. Grayson's success in Colne Valley seriously frightened the moderate middle-class man, and, when the moderate middle-class man is frightened, he votes blindly for any candidate calling himself Conservative. The Liberal Party is between devil and deep sea in this respect. If it is indulgent to Socialism it offends its moderates; if it joins in an anti-Socialist crusade it helps to create a scare which is meal and malt to its opponents. The alarm about Socialism was very skilfully fanned by Conservative electioneers after the Colne Valley election, and Mr. Grayson's election is likely to cost the Liberal Party dear. On top of it came the rise in the price of provisions, which gave the opponents of the Government a cry for the working-class, just as Socialism had given them a cry for the middle-

class. Then, as a climax, came the brewers' agitation, which skilfully combined both cries. The poor man, said the brewers, would have to pay more for his beer and the middle-class man would be hit in his investments. The most formidable of these movements was the last, since it commands an unequalled ready-made organisation which can be started at full blast at a moment's notice; and it was working on congenial material—a scare about property and a scare about the cost of provisions. The result was seen from the Mid-Devon election onwards, and for the time being we have witnessed a considerable reaction.

If we could rely on reason governing affairs, we might hope that each of these movements would contain within itself the seeds of its own cure. Men may differ from this or that proposal in the Licensing Bill, but the proof afforded of the enormous power wielded by the trade must suggest to them that the immediate danger is not that property should be successfully attacked by Socialists, but that it should assert itself inordinately over public interests. Here is a form of property which has a peculiarly defective title, which certainly has no moral support behind it, and can create no general sentiment in its favour, and yet the strongest Liberal Government of our time finds itself fighting for its life when it proposes merely to apply the principle of the time-limit to it. I think the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed a feeling which will grow when he spoke of the need of co-operation between men "whose main interest lies in the moral and religious side of our common life" to resist this brow-beating on the part of vested interests. By their threats to deprive churches of subscriptions, tradesmen of their custom, and workmen of their employment, unless they are allowed to dictate public policy on the drink question, the brewers have given us a foretaste of the electioneering methods of the American Trust. The reply of the Church of England to these threats has, as Dr. Horton well said, been a moral tonic to the country, and one may reasonably hope that the eventual gain in credit and respect which will accrue to the Government, if it holds its own course, will more than balance the temporary loss in votes or seats. And, in the meantime, the public must see by this example what an immense deal still has to be done before the State in this country gets even with a powerful vested interest.

So also with the dear food cry. When pressed, the Tariff Reformers themselves admit that the increase in the price of bread and other commodities is the result of natural causes—short harvests, increase of consumption, and so forth, for which no sane man could hold the Government responsible. They tell us, however, that it is a fair retort to the Free Traders' assertion that the loaf would be dear if corn were taxed. "You said it would be dear under our policy; we retort that it is dear under *your* rule!" The assertion and the retort are, of course, wholly unrelated. The fact that bread is dearer from

natural causes has nothing to do with the fact that it will be dearer if corn is taxed. The rise in the price from natural causes is, indeed, one reason the more for not raising it further by an artificial cause. But in so far as the Tariff Reformers have gained votes by appealing to the sentiment for cheap food, they have merely proved the enormous risks which attend experiments in this region. If a Liberal Government reaps unpopularity from a bad harvest, what would be the plight of the Unionist electioneerer if he returned again in two years' time, let us say, to Mid-Devon with 'a proposal for taxing the bread which, on his own showing, is too much? If a Liberal Government loses hundreds of votes on the remote chance that the price of coal may be raised by the Eight Hours' Bill, what is a Tariff party likely to lose when it proposes taxation which must raise the prices of the necessities of life?

The group of questions which are involved in the issue of Socialism and anti-Socialism admit of no cut and dried solution by either party. To discover the dividing line between what the State can and cannot do without destroying the individual energy of its citizens is, and must remain for generations to come, the master problem of all Governments in every country. We are not yet in sight of a formula which is likely to be final. Each generation and each country is likely to draw the line in a different way. Professor Dicey has told us that the last twenty years, which is outwardly the period of Unionist and Conservative ascendancy, will be known in history as the period of collectivism. Lord Rosebery, who warns us so impressively of the dangers of Socialism, was himself the inaugurator, as first chairman of the London County Council, of the Municipal Socialism—the sane Socialism, as one may call it—of the London County Council. Mr. Chamberlain, in his Radical days, while indignantly denying that he was a communist, even welcomed the suggestion that he was a Socialist. Let me quote one passage from the Introduction to "The Radical Programme," which was accepted as the authentic gospel of the Radical movement, twenty-three years ago. The measures proposed, says the writer:—

Sound the death-knell of the *laissez-faire* system, and if the labourer is not strong enough to look after himself, to take the initiative in the social reforms prompted by a rational estimate of private interest, there is an organised body of politicians in this country who will at least do thus much for him. If it be said that this is communism, the answer is that it is not. If it be said that it is legislation of a socialist tendency, the impeachment may readily be admitted. Between such legislation and communism there is all the difference in the world. Communism means the reduction of everything to a dead-level, the destruction of private adventure, the paralysis of private industry, the atrophy of private effort. The socialistic measures now contemplated would present in their normal vigour and freshness all the individual activities of English citizenship, and would do nothing more spoliatory than tax—if, and in what degree necessary—aggregations of wealth for the good of the community.

The possessor of the aggregations of wealth will, of course, always say that he is the victim of communism when it is proposed to "tax him for the good of the community," but the distinction which Mr. Chamberlain drew is quite sound, and affords a good working rule for present purposes. Individualist industry throws off an inordinate deal of human wreckage in its effort to procure its own efficiency. A well-governed community cannot be indifferent to this; the safety of the individualist system depends ultimately on its being prevented or mitigated. Liberal and Conservative parties alike stand committed to this principle. Both have employed the power of the State to regulate industry; both have made large uses of State credit and State funds for purposes which a previous generation would have denounced as pure Socialism; both have committed themselves to old-age pensions. Their differences at this moment are not as to the principle of State action, but as to the method of raising the taxation which that action requires. Another kind of Socialism there is; of course, a Socialism which cannot by any means be assimilated with the State as at present organised, and there is never any difficulty in recognising that kind when it appears. The Unemployed Bill, which a Liberal member of Parliament was rash enough to father this year, affords a test case. It proposed that every man or woman who registered himself or herself as unemployed should be entitled to receive employment from the State at the trade union rate of wages. That implies a State organised on entirely different principles from the existing State—a State which would relieve the individual from the necessity of seeking employment, and, since it undertook to give all sorts of employment, would have to command all sorts of industry. This is raw Socialism, leading directly to communism, and its adoption would be fatal to a State based on private enterprise. It has been explained to us that the Liberal members who gave a vote for this Bill did not endorse either its principle or its details, but intended merely to demonstrate their sympathy for the unemployed. It would, I think, have been much more convenient to find some other way of demonstrating sympathy with the unemployed; but, at all events, we have it on record that the Government refuse to have anything to do with this Bill, and that those Liberal members who voted for it had no intention of countenancing its proposals.

The main point, then, to remember about this controversy is that it is not a controversy about State action, but a controversy about taxation. The things that are called Socialism are as likely to be done by one party as the other. The Liberal party, as a rule, prepares the way and incurs the odium, and the Conservative party completes the work. In the present case the Conservative party proposes to raise the funds in one way and the Liberal party in another way. The *Spectator* does quite right to warn us that if the present Government incurs large expenditure on social reforms and

fails to show how it can be financed by the present fiscal system, it will have exposed Free Trade to a very great peril. But the peril would be no less, if, at the end of this Parliament, we had to say that social reforms which we think to be of the highest importance were impossible, because they could not be financed without sacrificing Free Trade. There could be no folly or iniquity greater than to propose Old-age Pensions at this moment if we did not believe in them, or if we desired merely to bribe the working class; there could be no more grievous confession of failure if we do believe in them and yet are obliged to confess that we are unable to provide the means for them. Equally disastrous would it be if we left the impression that the funds were being found by any dangerous cheese-paring of expenditure on the Navy or the Army. These are difficult problems, and I don't think we can overrate the extent to which opinion in the country will be determined by the Budgets of the next two years. There are dangers on either hand, dangers in incurring expenditure and dangers in not incurring it; and, most of all, there is no safety in sitting still and shelving the problem. But if we look back over the last twelve years, and see the comparative ease with which an additional revenue of forty millions a year has been provided, I don't think a prudent and resourceful Chancellor of the Exchequer need in the least despair of finding the solution without leaving the door open to those experiments in "broadening the basis of taxation" which would be the opportunity of the Protectionists.

* * *

Let us now turn for a moment to the situation in Parliament. If a clever critic of political strategy were sitting down to write a memorandum upon the past performance, present position, and future prospects of the Government, he could score a dozen good points against their conduct of affairs. He would say that the problem of the House of Lords had not been thought out, and that in consequence the Lords had succeeded in imposing their strategy on the Commons instead of the Commons imposing their strategy on the Lords. Now the strategy of the Lords is, by baulking the Government at the beginning of their career, to compel them to return to highly controversial subjects at a later period, when the reaction will have set in, and it was only to be defeated by establishing the belief at the outset that the Government would resent these blows even at the risk of their lives. If, for instance, Mr. Balfour and Lord Lansdowne had seriously believed that the destruction of the Plural Voting Bill and the Education Bill in 1906 would have been followed by an appeal to the country in January, 1907, it is as certain as anything can be that both these Bills would have been passed. The House of Lords question, we may say in parentheses, will be settled for a generation when a Liberal Government has carried a successful appeal to the country against the rejection or mutilation of its Bills.

by the Peers, and will not otherwise be settled by any scheme or plan that ingenious people can devise. In the present case the Government refused to dissolve, and fell back on a plan to take effect in a future about which no one knew anything. I am not now criticising the refusal to dissolve; the reversal of an immense party engine within twelve months of a tremendous electoral success is one of those things which do not happen in practical politics, and Mr. Balfour was quite right in assuming that it would not happen in 1907. But certain consequences followed from this refusal which the Government might have been expected to foresee. First, that if dissolution was rejected, demonstrations would prove useless; and, next, that to send rejected Bills a second time to the Lords would not increase the chance of passing them, unless the Government were prepared either to settle them by compromise, or to treat a second rejection as a matter of life and death. Assuming that dissolution was impossible in 1907, there was only one sound course, from a strategical point of view, and that was to defer protest and demonstration until an election was in sight, and to send no Bill up a second time unless there was a fair chance of a settlement being arrived at. To invite a blow which, like the second rejection of the Scottish Land Bill, could not be resented, was obviously a blunder for a fighting party. At this stage the House of Lords must be faced for what it is—an Opposition, desiring, like the Opposition in the House of Commons, to inflict as much mischief as possible on the Government. It may restrain its instincts for prudential reasons—the fear of causing a reaction against itself in the country or of forcing a dissolution earlier than is convenient to its friends in the other House—but it is not likely to be more merciful to a Liberal Government in the later than in the earlier years of a Parliament. Mere strategy, therefore, requires that there shall be a gradual abatement of the more acute controversies if the Government intends to live out the normal term of its existence, and to do so without mortification or loss of credit.

Governments and parties, however, are not cold-blooded institutions which can be governed by the pure reason of the strategist. They are impetuous, and human, and wilful. Resentment is felt, and must be expressed. Letters come pouring into the Whips' office, declaring that supporters will be chilled unless the Government can *do* something, which generally means *say* something, and calling for strong leadership, which too often means being led by the least patient section of the party. A few men with passionate convictions can force a whole party to courses which are electorally suicidal. Yet this, after all, is the way that politics get on, and if it is once understood that the object of a party is not to get and keep office, but to promote causes, we need not complain. A Liberal party, at all events, would not be doing its work for this country if it turned its back

on its dreamers and enthusiasts, and delivered itself into the hands of schemers and strategists who promised it long life and security of tenure on condition that it did nothing which could offend anybody. The idea of a prudent, sober-judging, slow-moving centre-party has no charm for the intellectually adventurous, and still less, I fancy, for the average elector. It would, in practice, be the rule of the Philistines, however eminent and authoritative its heavy fathers might be. The more impeccable its behaviour, the more certainly would it share the fate of Aristides.

A Liberal leader, then, is always in a dilemma. If he studies the Parliamentary situation too much, he will chill the more ardent of his supporters in the country; if he studies it too little, he will get into a deadlock with the House of Lords, and bring his programme into confusion. We cannot imagine Mr. Asquith promising, as Mr. Balfour did in 1904, not to burden his followers with over much "legislation," if they would help him to remain in office. The supporters of a Liberal Government do not want it to remain in office unless it can do things, and the things they want done are just the things which the House of Lords does not want to do. Thus a skilful Opposition leader, with the House of Lords at his back, has a comparatively easy game to play. He can discredit the Government with its own supporters by rejecting its Bills, and compel it to choose between returning to the subject at a much less convenient season and incurring the wrath of staunch adherents who will otherwise say they are betrayed. We see that most conspicuously in the case of the Education question. The destruction of the Bill of 1906 was, from Mr. Balfour's point of view, the most skilful strategical move that he could take against the Government in its first session. For it instantly placed the Government in a dilemma. If the new Parliament was not to be dissolved on that issue, they had to choose between leaving the question alone, which meant offending their Nonconformist supporters, and re-introducing it in another session, when, as Mr. Balfour probably foresaw, they would have lost their first impulse and have become entangled in other highly controversial questions. Hence the inevitable concurrence against all warning and experience of licensing and education in this third session of the Parliament.

Thus, though the armchair strategists who deal with men as counters may find all manner of fault with the arrangement of business and the procedure of Ministers, the practical politician will be slow to say what other procedure would have avoided the difficulties or led to a better result. After all, it is a great thing that after two and a half years the only criticism which a convinced Liberal is able to pass on the present Government is a criticism of strategy. They have done, and are doing, the things which they were pledged to do, and which the Liberal electors sent them to power to do. They have

set their mark deep in history by the settlement of the South African question; they have carried through foreign affairs of much greater difficulty than the public realise with honour and credit; they have made a serious effort for the reform of the English land question, and passed a great variety of measures which, like the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Merchant Shipping Act, will have far-reaching effects on the daily lives of large numbers of the community. The storm rages about them on the licensing question, but the great mass of their supporters would far rather that they faced it and suffered the consequences than that they flinched and procrastinated for the sake of a quiet life. "It may be that the gulfs will wash us down," but here, at all events, are things worth doing and worth fighting for. The next two years will decide whether there is enough persistence of Liberal sentiment in the country to carry the Government through against the opposing forces, or whether Liberalism is an impulse which comes up about every twenty years, and then fails, as soon as the Government which it returned to power has seriously set its hand to the work which it was instructed to do. If the latter is the right answer, the Liberal need not despair; he is working under a free system and he must accept the results with patience and philosophy, and devote himself to the work of educating the electors up to his opinions. But in the meantime we should have to take it as settled that the country wanted no more temperance reform than is acceptable to the brewers, no more land reform than is acceptable to the landlords, no change in education which is unacceptable to the Church, and that, rather than exceed these limits, it is prepared for the control of a party which will abolish Free Trade.

That is, shortly stated, the question which will be before the country from now to the end of the Parliament. I would not for a moment be supposed to imply that it is settled against the Government. On the contrary, I think the reverses which the Government have suffered at recent by-elections are due largely to the fact that it has not been stated and is not clearly seen. We are not dealing with an ordinary situation, in which the presumption is that opinion in the middle of a Parliament is a sure test of opinion at the end. The Opposition is for once an Opposition with a definite policy, which it must make good before it returns to power. It may have great success in attacking the Government on separate issues at by-elections, and yet find itself in great difficulties when it comes to propose a rival policy. The Tariff Reformers boast of their success at by-elections where they call upon local interests to defend themselves by excluding foreign competition. Even this is probably exaggerated; but it is, at all events, a very different thing from a policy submitted to the whole country in which one local interest will be seen to conflict with another local interest, and the great general interests which are based on Free Trade are openly challenged and

compelled to take the defensive. We have scarcely begun to explore that situation, and it is one of the chief tasks of the Government to see that it is thoroughly explored before the next election. Their duty in this respect may in some respects conflict with the short and sharp measures which might otherwise be suitable to a mere party fight with their opponents, but it is paramount. The Government cannot, when this session is over, embark on any large new controversial issues which might divide the Free Trade forces and enable the Opposition to attack them in detail. A clear Free Trade policy with constructive elements in it is another thing, and there is more to be done in this respect than is yet realised; but from the beginning of next year to the end of the Parliament there must be a gradual concentration for the defence of Free Trade.

To say this is not to suggest that the Liberal Party should weaken in its principles or shift its centre of gravity. It is not a question between Whig and Radical, or left wing and right wing; but simply a question of how much of a programme on which we are all agreed can be accomplished in a given time, and how the Liberal and Free Trade appeal to the country can be made in the clearest manner and with the best prospect of success. There are two possible courses before the present Government, either of which is intelligible, but they will not bear mixing. One is to force the pace, to refuse all compromises, and, if a conflict ensues with the House of Lords, to carry the issue to the country; the other is to get the best that can be got by give and take during the present session, to wind up as many as possible of the more embittered controversies, to devote next session to the great constructive work of the reform of the Poor Law, and from now to the end of the Parliament to apply all possible energy to the Free Trade propaganda in the country. If, as seems to be generally assumed, the second course is to be chosen, let its consequences be accepted. The atmosphere is favourable to conciliation on the Education question, and even if the Nonconformists cannot get all they want, let the opportunity be taken and the utmost effort made to end a quarrel which is not merely a party embarrassment, but a grievous obstacle to educational progress. Then the way will be clear to combine all the available moral energy on the question of temperance. Here there may be room for concession about the terms or the length of years, but the principle of the time-limit is just and sound, and will, I believe, surmount all obstacles. As for the administrative parts of the Bill, they will even bear strengthening in some important particulars. But, whatever happens, let it not be forgotten that the defeat of the time-limit would mean that the brewers and the shareholders in brewing companies had successfully established their claim to treat the licences granted by the State as their private freeholds. That is an immensely important issue for the public, whether from the moral or from the material

point of view, and if it is presented with force and courage there ought, in the long run, to be no doubt about the answer.

* * *

It is difficult for those who watch events from day to day to realise the change in mental attitude which comes over parties in the course of years. The present Unionist party may obey the instinct which tells an Opposition to oppose, but in so far as it falls under the influence of the Protectionists, it loses its hold on Conservative principles. Mr. Balfour, Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Curzon stand together at the moment for normal Conservative politics, and though their words are ambiguous, it is plain that their desire is to reduce the Tariff movement to the minimum covered by their formula of "broadening the basis of taxation." But throughout the country the appeal to the voter is on purely Protectionist lines, and if their party were to win the next election it would stand committed to the entire fiscal revolution. This and all that it means and threatens to the immense interests that are built up on Free Trade has to be brought home to the public between the present time and the general election. There is no faith to be reposed in the frail structure which Mr. Balfour has thrown up as refuge alike from Free Traders and Protectionists. One or other must win, and whichever wins will dictate the policy of the country for many years to come. If a Protectionist party comes to power after the next election there will for years to come be no dividing line and no dominant issue in politics but Protection. All else will be opportunism, and a Tariff party would more nearly resemble the Republican party in the United States than either of the old parties as we have known them. It will be Liberal or Conservative, or even Socialistic, according as may be convenient to its main object.

The real parties, then, that are likely to confront us at the next election will be the Liberal Free Traders, the Conservative or Unionist Free Traders, and the opportunist Tariff Reformers. The Unionist Free Traders are, of course, very small numerically, but their importance is much greater than their numbers; and if they advise the wavering elector to throw in his lot with the Tariff Reformers rather than support the Liberal party, the Government and Free Trade will have received a severe blow. Their position is difficult, and it is impossible to give them complete satisfaction. Greatly as the Liberal party may be devoted to Free Trade, it cannot abandon the Liberal part of its policy to obtain their support. That, after all, would be the surest way of destroying Free Trade. But it may be suggested to the Unionist Free Trader that if he votes for the Tariff Reformer or withdraws his support from the Government at the next election he may easily destroy Free Trade without obtaining any relief from the legislation which he calls Socialistic.

The intellectual classes, Mr. Bryce has just told us in an address

delivered in America, are always critics of any tendency in politics which may happen to prevail. They were partisans of democracy while Europe was under arbitrary government; they became critics of democracy when the populace came to power. No Government is ever likely to correspond to their ideal. A Unionist Government would no more be a left-centre Government than the present Liberal Government. For the Unionist party also is appealing to and would be swayed by the mass of people who feel rather than think, and whose demand for better conditions of life is producing the legislation which is called Socialistic. At the same time, the peculiar cross-currents of politics which are perplexing some conscientious people at this moment will, if the Government is skilfully and powerfully led, have become merged in the main streams of politics before the general election. The difficulties of the man who cannot vote for Church Schools without voting against Free Trade, or who is prevented from supporting the Licensing Bill because he is afraid of the Eight Hours' Bill, are quite temporary, and will pass as these controversies are disposed of. These are the hard cases of the party system, and the intellectuals find them very afflicting, but they would make bad law. Nevertheless the present complication of issues is a mistake, and an effort should be made to simplify it. It has arisen largely from the habit which Ministers have contracted in the last few years of working in watertight compartments without relation to each other or to the general effectiveness of the Government. Their energy and ability have been beyond praise, but their output is so miscellaneous, and requires such rapid change of thought from subject to subject, that it has left the public breathless and uncomprehending. The work of this session must be mainly a work of clearing up, so that a start may be made on broader and simpler lines. If that is done, the obvious work which opens up for next session is to develop a unified social policy out of old-age pensions, Poor Law reform, and the various proposals for dealing with unemployment, and to bring all these questions into their right relation with each other. The work for the country is not less clear, and it is to make the Free Trade propaganda the equal of the Tariff propaganda, and to show all that is at stake in the proposed Fiscal revolution. On these two lines the Government may finish its career with credit, and put its case to the country in a powerful and effective manner. We can hardly imagine a situation in which Mr. Asquith's special qualities—his skill in management, his coolness and clearness, and great gifts as a speaker—could be more serviceable.

J. A. SPENDER.

THE NEW ELECTRIC ORDNANCE.

I was scarcely prepared for the interest which has been excited by my very cautious reference, in an article in this REVIEW,* to Mr. Simpson's new Electric Ordnance, and the consequent possibility of the abolition of war, and I must confess that the tone and temper of many of the communications I have received lead me reluctantly to the conclusion that my hopes for the coming of the millennium were premature, and that many ages of bloodshed and strife will probably intervene before the spirit of contradiction from which ultimately all wars arise is sufficiently laid to afford prospect of a reign of settled peace.

Yet I sympathise with my assailants, for I myself suffered under all their illusions as to the impossibility of a recoilless gun, etc., until I saw the weapon with my own eyes and realised the extreme simplicity of the means by which the inventor has overcome these seemingly insuperable difficulties. This is hardly the place to enter into a prolonged mathematical explanation of the observed results, but I may say in passing that Mr. Simpson has not tampered with the Newtonian laws of motion, that the whole problem is well within the power of our existing mathematical methods of research, and that a complete solution of it will be offered at the proper time and place.

The immediate and practical value of the new weapon lies far less in the possibilities of extreme velocities and ranges revealed in my previous article than in its extraordinary adaptability to all the circumstances of war, whether on sea or land, as they may arise. Unlike the ordinary high velocity gun of the present day, the trajectory of which can only be modified by alterations in the weight of the charge not usually undertaken in the field, the control of the new weapon is so complete that it can deliver its projectiles at any

* "Can Science Abolish War?" CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, April, 1908.

required velocity from, say, 100 f.s. up to its extreme power which, as I have said, may reach 30,000⁰; nor is it confined to the use of projectiles of fixed weight for each type of gun; but it can throw shells of any weight most convenient for the purpose of the moment, and can be made so light in proportion to its power that it may be looked upon as capable of fulfilling in one single form all the functions of mountain artillery, howitzers, and field artillery, whilst the source of the power necessary for its use can be packed like an ordinary ammunition waggon, and the power itself can be transmitted through field cables to any reasonable distances.

I have been asked what effect this weapon is likely to exercise upon the tactics of land warfare, and in view of the difficulties surrounding the provision of suitable batteries for the new Territorial Army, a short investigation of the question may be useful.

Battles are no longer fought for the "honour of the arms," but with the strict utilitarian purpose of taking possession of certain ground necessary for the prosecution of ulterior strategical designs. This is the fundamental point to be kept in view, and no alterations in armaments can affect the question; hence every battle must end with an advance of the whole army in force to drive the enemy from the disputed position.

But this final advance can only take place when, as a consequence of acquired fire superiority, the defenders are no longer able to oppose an adequate resistance; and it is quite immaterial by what means this necessary fire superiority has been attained—whether by bows and arrows, muskets, case shot, or modern shrapnel shell; all that is essential is that the superiority should be adequate for the required purpose—whether that be, as in an ordinary engagement, the passage of an unimpeded hillside slope, or, as in a siege, the surmounting of every conceivable passive obstacle the mind of man can devise, or any intermediate stage between the two extremes. It is important that this basic idea should be kept in mind, because ignorance of its truth is the principal source of half the disasters in the field, and of all the troubles that beset the path both of the General in war and of the organiser in peace.

In order to secure possession of a disputed position, it is not necessary to break down the resistance uniformly throughout its whole extent. It is enough to disturb the equilibrium at a single point for the defence to collapse, and it is the power of choosing this point in advance that constitutes the abiding advantage of the attack over the defence, which no change in armaments can ever eliminate.

In the days of Frederick the Great artillery was still so immobile, and technically so undeveloped, that the task of securing the fire superiority rested mainly on the infantry, who had to be brought up to decisive ranges before they could overpower the fire of the

defenders, and even then could do nothing against physical obstacles. In Napoleon's time the artillery had gained so much in mobility that it was possible to bring up masses of guns to case-shot range (300-500 yards, *i.e.*, outside the effective fire of infantry), and from thence to tear out a gap in the opposing line of infantry, through which cavalry, guns and infantry could be poured to complete the victory. But the practicability of this attack depended on two points, *viz.*: first, on the rapidity of his strategical manœuvres, which allowed the enemy no time to entrench the threatened point, and thus compelled him to oppose a wall of flesh and blood to Napoleon's machinery of destruction; and, secondly, on the existence in the immediate front of the enemy's line of a suitable position on which to deploy the artillery mass—two conditions which not even the Emperor's genius could always succeed in securing. But the increment in range which has meanwhile accrued to the artillery has already sufficed to eliminate both these conditions. It is scarcely possible to conceive a position in front of which suitable sites for artillery masses, whether firing directly or indirectly, cannot be found in sufficient numbers; and because guns can nowadays fire over each other, it is practicable to concentrate such an enormous number of projectiles on any required point that, even though they cannot destroy earthwork defences, they can pour in such a hail of destruction upon them that their defenders cannot see to aim, and unless they aim their fire is of even less account now than it used to be formerly.*

The new weapons only serve to intensify these advantages, for whereas it will be well nigh impossible for the defender to locate and silence any individual gun or battery, owing to the absence of any flash, the numbers of weapons the attack can turn upon the point selected for assault has become so great that there is no longer any necessity for extreme accuracy, either of laying or observation, as all the destruction necessary can be accomplished by taking an "area," not a "point," under fire and covering it with such a hail of bullets or other man-killing fragments that for the time the defenders are paralysed. This was the secret of the original French artillery attack by *rafales* or gusts of fire, which is now common to all armies; but

* In war, infantry fire is never entirely unaimed or entirely aimed, but fluctuates between these two extremes, according to the difficulties of aiming introduced by the enemy's return fire. The essence of a Leader's business is to accumulate such aim-disturbing conditions upon his adversaries' position, before launching his own troops for the decisive attack, that the fire they have to face will approximate as closely as possible to the "unaimed" limit. The probability of a man being hit in an advance by an unaimed bullet, *i.e.*, by one fired off in the general direction of the enemy, varies as some function of the cube of the range multiplied by the time of exposure, and applied to the conditions existing in Frederick the Great's day and in Manchuria respectively, it indicates that whereas the most skilful old-time general could not hope to lose less than 20 per cent of his strength, and might be annihilated, nowadays an attack need not lose more than 2 per cent, whilst of course it suffers the same risk of annihilation if the commander happens to misjudge his time.—For a fuller discussion of this problem, see a paper by the writer in the Journal of the Royal United Service Institution for March, 1901, and also Chapter XII. of his book "War, and the World's Life."

with the new weapons it will be possible to apply it over greater areas and with greater certainty. Hence, in the future, we may reasonably anticipate seeing large fractions of a defending army absolutely held to their ground, and for the time being paralysed; and during that time the assailant can execute what movements he pleases as a preliminary to the great final advance. Certainly that final advance will ultimately be met as heretofore by infantry fire, for a time must come when the artillery can no longer continue its fire over the heads of the assaulting lines or masses, and then an infantry duel will supervene, as it always has done; and in this the most determined fighters will win as of old, only, as in the assault on the breach in a fortress, the previous successive steps in the process of preparation will render it almost inevitable that the most determined men will be found in the ranks of the assaulting side, not on that of the defenders.

It will be evident from the above that numbers, not efficiency, are the first conditions for success in such encounters, for in proportion as the number of weapons whose fire can be directed on any given area increases, the value of individually accurate laying and observation decreases. It is no longer a case of hitting a "point" but of deluging an area; and for this purpose a battery of the new weapons, furnished only with the compass bearing and range within a thousand yards or so, will be as useful at 20,000 yards as an existing battery at 5,000.

As a concrete case, marshal our Territorial Army, with its proposed 190 batteries, against one of equal numbers with only 33 batteries, on any conceivable field in England, and note the result. I do not claim to be the sole depository of Mr. Simpson's confidence in this matter, and it seems to me at least conceivable that this advent of the new weapon has not only been at the bottom of our land artillery programmes, but may also account for many seemingly inexplicable aberrations in our naval estimates. It would not be the first official secret we have succeeded in keeping by any means.

Turning now to the naval question alluded to in my previous article, it has been objected to me that though we have the ships we have not the men to man them; and that, in fact, the undesirable alien has driven out the British seaman to an extent which seriously disturbs the basis of my position.

I confess I can find no official figures sufficient to justify this pessimistic conclusion, but such figures as I have been able to obtain suggest that the official figures have been kept in a manner as unsatisfactory as those on which our land organisation has been settled. As in the case of the men who complete their service in the Army Reserve, the Militia and Volunteers, I want to know what becomes of all the men who pass through the Royal Navy and are still of an age to render efficient service.

In foreign countries a man is held fit for service up to the age of 40 or 45, and in great emergencies up to 60. What evidence is there to show that an Englishman deteriorates more quickly? If this is not the case—and without absolute demonstration I refuse to believe it—then at a low estimate there must be upwards of 300,000 ex-blue-jackets and marines alive and fit somewhere within the British Empire to supplement the 180,000 merchant seamen (British) who are constantly at sea; and of these only about 30,000 are already pledged to rejoin the Royal Navy.

If these are not sufficient or, even under pressure of starvation, refuse to come forward—which seems to me altogether inconceivable—these islands in the event of war will be crowded with trained soldiers of all sorts, waiting until the sea has been cleared to find a field for their energies. Cannot some of these be given the opportunity to serve their country at sea? Seeing that in the days of Cromwell, when the service of a gun on board ship was a complicated matter, needing a crew of from 8 to 12 men, all trained to work together, even cavalry soldiers took their share in fighting our ships, surely with men of our present-day standard of intelligence the far simpler task of assisting the expert gunlayers at their work might safely be entrusted to them to-day. As regards their willingness to accept such service, it may be of interest to add that some few years ago, in one of the many crises through which we have passed, certain officers were directed to find out privately how such a proposal to serve on board ship would be received by the men, and the replies received were uniformly satisfactory. The men quite saw the position, and were ready to follow their officers anywhere. When it was pointed out that this might include even service in the stokeholes, they raised no objection; but the stokehole with its horrors may be a thing of the past in another generation, and is so already in some happy ships. Hence I do not think it rationally possible to conceive our maritime supremacy as seriously assailable. But if, and as far as, the pessimistic pictures of the decadence of the British seaman are well founded, then I am furnished with the strongest of all arguments for that *nationalisation of the merchant navy*, which I have always advocated.

Our food and raw material depend upon the efficiency of this service at all times, and in war, even under existing conditions, the risks it will have to face will be very heavy. Surely it is time our national responsibility for these men who serve us should be recognised by the provision of adequate pensions for those who survive the very real perils of the sea, many times greater than those which confront the average soldier, and their lot improved by compelling owners to pay more attention to their health and comfort. It is there that the whole crux of the difficulty lies: no self-respecting ex-blue-jacket will consent of his own free will to share the discomforts of the

foe'sle with the men such filthy surroundings can alone attract; and thus we are prevented from establishing a sound system of short service in the Navy, which would make that service what it ought to be, and what the Army is rapidly becoming, viz., the National University for the people—an institution which should do for the character of those who pass through its ranks all and more than our existing universities are alleged to do for their pupils.

Any such improvements would cost money, which the shipowners naturally allege is not to be found under existing competitive conditions; and that forms the best reason for the State to step in and assert that the safety of the nation is not to be jeopardised by short-sighted economy; and by eliminating cut-throat competition between rival lines and centralising authority sufficient economies could be made to compensate for the increased expenditure.

The financial operations involved in the transfer of all the principal lines to the Government would be quite small in proportion to the amount involved in the proposed nationalisation of the railways—roughly 100 millions as against a capital value of 1,000 millions; and the principal argument against the railway proposal, viz., that absence of competition would lead to inefficiency of service, falls to the ground in face of the remarkable competition to which we are already subjected by indirectly subsidised foreign lines, which is becoming more formidable year by year, and of the searching test of efficiency to which all who go down to the sea in ships are always exposed, and which they too often fail to stand, as witness the annual statistics of shipwrecks, which are far higher than they ought to be. That such nationalisation would be popular both with officers and men admits of no doubt. It would give to both an assured status and security in life which, as vital factors of our national life, they most assuredly deserve; and with this improved status would come a general levelling up of efficiency which would go far to make the original outlay remunerative.

With our supremacy at sea thus definitely secured, as I contend that it would be, there would remain only our credit open to the attack of our enemies; for if we can eliminate the danger of a surprise invasion by an act which, if applied against us, we should designate as "treacherous," but which, from the enemy's point of view, would appear to be an act of the highest statesmanship—justified, as we have always justified "Copenhagen," on the grounds *Salus reipublicæ suprema lex*—then no European Power could dream of attacking us, since all alike recognise our enormous power for defence if we are allowed time enough to mobilise our immense resources.

But a blow at our credit would be almost as fatal as invasion itself, and would form quite as legitimate a weapon in the armoury of diplomacy.

The object of war is to compel an enemy to submit his will to

yours ; and according to the modern code "all means are lawful," though "all may not be expedient" ; and some are, or may be at times, unpracticable. When the interests of two great trading corporations clash, and the police interpose to prevent direct violence, an attack on credit, carefully designed and sprung as a surprise, is so frequently employed that it seems impossible that its efficacy can long escape the penetration of the modern men of business, who are everywhere supplanting the older school of statesmen in the conduct of international relations.

The possibility of such an attack upon our credit seems to me sufficiently foreshadowed by the recent address delivered to the Royal United Service Institution by Sir Robert Giffen, with Sir Felix Schuster in the chair, in which he drew a most convincing picture of the weakness of our existing credit system in the event of war, and showed the ease and certainty with which such an attack could, even under existing circumstances, be arranged.

Briefly, about 1,000 millions of credit transactions are supported on a total gold currency not much exceeding 100 millions, of which not more than about 30 millions are actually available as a gold reserve in the Bank of England ; and against this foreign nations hold bills payable on demand alone amounting to nearly 100 millions.* Normally, notwithstanding this small reserve of gold, our banks are perfectly solvent, as they hold gilt-edged securities amply sufficient to cover their liabilities, if time enough is granted them, in which to liquidate their assets.

But this is just what an enemy would not allow us, and now this new weapon steps in and gives him the power of actually destroying by fire and explosion much of the actual property on which these securities are based. To see the reality of the menace such long range bombardment contains, it is only necessary to take a one-inch map of the London district and flick a few penfulls of ink over it at haphazard : then draw a circle with 10 yards radius in red ink round each blot, and ask any of our fire insurance offices to estimate the destruction of property which would be involved if each 10-yard circlet represented the radius of destruction of a shell containing 500lbs. of some high explosive.

In the old days, when our banking system first originated, practically all securities accepted by banks were based on the agricultural value of the land, which in war time automatically appreciated. Now it is on the value of the buildings actually constructed, together with their contents, that values finally rest, and these will depreciate as automatically as the values of the others used to rise. Of course this is but the briefest statement of the position ; but the distinction between the value of property based on trade and all

* France alone holds bills to the amount of 80 millions, and could legally present them, subject to discount, any day in the year.

that trade involves, as compared with that of property based on the supply of absolute necessities, such as corn, forage, meat, etc., is sufficiently clear to indicate the nature of our danger.

It also suggests the remedy, which is at once more simple and far more practical than the only one hitherto suggested by bankers, viz., the increase of the gold reserve.

In times of panic nations revert to their primitive instincts, foremost amongst which is the tendency to hoard gold; the consequence is that not only is the gold reserve depleted by legitimate banking demands, but what gold there actually is in circulation is buried or hidden away, and only sheer necessity will induce its owners to part with it.

Now the direst of all necessities in a civilised country is hunger. Hence the man who holds the food supplies is always certain to draw the gold, a fact well known to the governors of besieged places in days when warfare was chronic. The provision dealers drew the gold from the stockings of the old women, and the governors, pledging the credit of the State, borrowed from the provision dealers to pay the troops and labourers employed in the defence, from whose pockets it again found its way to the provision dealers—including the tavern keepers—and thus maintained a constant circulation.*

I propose a similar solution of our difficulties, and suggest that our banks and insurance offices generally should be compelled to distribute their investments in such proportion over foods (meat as well as corn—cold storage and other processes coming into use render this possible) and ordinary peace-time securities, that in war time the rise in price of the one will compensate the fall in value of the other, and thus maintain a constant value under all conditions. It must be remembered that the acute stages of panic cannot be of long duration, for after a very few weeks our superiority in numbers at sea is certain to assert itself—and actually not much more stock would be required to be held in hand than the great provision dealers already carry to meet the fluctuations of the market; but there is this essential difference between this proposal and that for the augmentation of the gold reserve, viz., that whereas the provision dealer can borrow freely on his stock, by the nature of the case, the banker can make no use of his augmented gold reserve, or it would cease to constitute a reserve at all.

But roughly each sovereign of gold supports 100 pounds' worth of credit transactions annually, so that if, say, 30 millions of gold were withdrawn from circulation to strengthen the bank reserve, 3,000 millions of trade per annum would be paralysed, which is sufficient to show the *prima facie* impossibility of the proposal.

* See "Frederick the Great's Secret Instructions to Commanders of Fortresses." The Napoleonic code met the difficulty by refusing to allow any baker to start business in a fortress until he could satisfy the authorities that he had a sufficient stock of flour on his premises to stand a six months' siege; and this rule is I believe still in force in France.

This estimate is based on a statement made in the discussion of the paper above alluded to at the Royal United Service Institution, to the effect that the average of cheques dealt with daily at the Clearing House amounted to 100 millions, which, taking 300 working days to the year, would give a total of 30,000 millions a year as the aggregate exchange of values within these Islands.

F. N. MAUDE

THE ETHER OF SPACE.*

BY SIR OLIVER LODGE.

THIRTY years ago Clerk Maxwell gave a remarkable lecture on "Action at a Distance." Like most other natural philosophers, he held that action at a distance across empty space is impossible; in other words, that matter cannot act where it is not, but only where it is. The question "where is it?" is a further question that may demand attention and require more than a superficial answer. For it can be argued on the hydrodynamic or vortex theory of matter, as well as on the electrical theory, that every atom of matter has a universal, though nearly infinitesimal, prevalence, and extends everywhere; since there is no definite sharp boundary or limiting periphery to the region disturbed by its existence. The lines of force of an isolated electric charge extend throughout illimitable space. And though a charge of opposite sign will curve and concentrate them, yet it is possible to deal with both charges, by the method of superposition, as if they each existed separately without the other. In that case, therefore, however far they reach, such nuclei clearly exert no "action at a distance" in the technical sense.

Some philosophers have reason to suppose that mind can act directly on mind without intervening mechanism, and sometimes that has been spoken of as genuine action at a distance; but, in the first place, no proper conception or physical model can be made of such a process, nor is it clear that space and distance have any particular meaning in the region of psychology. The links between mind and mind may be something quite other than physical proximity, and in denying action at a distance across empty space I am not denying telepathy or other activities of a non-physical kind; for although brain disturbance is certainly physical, and is an essential concomitant of mental action, whether of the sending or receiving variety, yet we know from the case of heat that a material movement can be excited in one place at the expense of corresponding movement in another,

* A Friday evening discourse at the Royal Institution of Great Britain on the 21st February, 1908.

without any similar kind of transmission or material connexion between the two places: the thing that travels across vacuum is not heat.

In all cases where physical motion is involved, however, I would have a medium sought for; it may not be matter, but it must be something; there must be a connecting link of some kind, or the transference cannot occur. There can be no attraction across really empty space. And even when a material link exists, so that the connexion is obvious, the explanation is not complete; for when the mechanism of attraction is understood, it will be found that a body really only moves because it is pushed by something from behind. The essential force in nature is the *vis a tergo*. So when we have found the "traces" or discovered the connecting thread, we still run up against the word "cohesion," and ought to be exercised in our minds as to its ultimate meaning. Why the particles of a rod should follow, when one end is pulled, is a matter requiring explanation; and the only explanation that can be given involves, in some form or other, a continuous medium connecting the discrete and separated particles or atoms of matter.

When a steel spring is bent or distorted, what is it that is really strained? Not the atoms—the atoms are only displaced; it is the connecting links that are strained—the connecting medium—the ether. Distortion of a spring is really distortion of the ether. All stress exists in the ether. Matter can only be moved. Contact does not exist between the atoms of matter as we know them; it is doubtful if a piece of matter ever touches another piece, any more than a comet touches the sun when it appears to rebound from it; but the atoms are connected, as the planets, the comets, and the sun are connected, by a continuous *plenum* without break or discontinuity of any kind. Matter acts on matter solely through the ether. But whether matter is a specifically modified portion of it—modified in such a way as to be a thing utterly distinct and separate from the ether, or whether it be susceptible of locomotion, and yet continuous with all the rest of the ether—which can be said to extend everywhere, far beyond the bounds of the modified and tangible portion called matter—are questions demanding, and I may say in process of receiving, answers.

Every such answer involves some view of the universal, and possibly infinite, uniform omnipresent connecting medium, the ether of space.

Let us now recall the chief lines of evidence on which the existence of such a medium is believed in, and our knowledge of it is based. First of all, Newton recognised the need of a medium for explaining gravitation. In his "Optical Queries" he shows that if the pressure of this medium is less in the neighbourhood of material bodies than at great distances from them, those bodies will be driven towards each other; and that if the diminution of pressure is inversely as the distance from the dense body, the law will be that of gravitation.

All that is required, therefore, to explain gravity is a diminution of pressure, or increase of tension, caused by the formation of a matter unit—that is to say, of an electron or corpuscle; and although we do not yet know what an electron is—whether it be a strain centre, or what kind of singularity it is in the ether—there is no difficulty in supposing that a slight, almost infinitesimal, strain or attempted rarefaction should have been produced in the ether whenever an electron came into being; to be relaxed again only on its resolution and destruction. Strictly speaking, it is not a real *strain*, but only a “stress”; since there can be no actual *yield*, but only a pull or tension, extending in all directions towards infinity.

The tension required per unit of matter is almost ludicrously small, and yet in the aggregate, near such a body as a planet, it becomes enormous.

The force with which the moon is held in its orbit would be great enough to tear asunder a steel rod four hundred miles thick, with a tenacity of 30 tons per square inch; so that if the moon and earth were connected by steel instead of by gravity, a forest of pillars would be necessary to whirl the system once a month round their common centre of gravity. Such a force necessarily implies enormous tension or pressure in the medium. Maxwell calculates that the gravitational stress near the earth, which we must suppose to exist in the invisible medium, is 3,000 times greater than what the strongest steel could stand; and near the sun it should be 2,500 times as great as that.

The question has arisen in my mind whether, if the whole visible or sensible universe,—estimated by Lord Kelvin as equivalent to about a thousand million tons,—were all concentrated in one body of specifiable density,* the stress would not be so great as to produce a tendency towards ethereal disruption; which would result in a disintegrating explosion, and a scattering of the particles once more as an enormous nebula and other fragments into the depths of space. For the tension would be a maximum in the interior of such a mass; and, if it rose to the value 10^{33} dynes per square centimetre, something would have to happen. I do not suppose that this can be the reason, but one would think there must be *some* reason, for the scattered condition of gravitative matter.

Too little is known, however, about the mechanism of gravitation to enable us to adduce it as the strongest argument in support of the existence of an ether. The oldest valid and conclusive requisition of an ethereal medium depends on the wave theory of light, one of the founders of which was Dr. Thomas Young, at the beginning of last century.

No ordinary matter is capable of transmitting the undulations or tremors that we call light. The speed at which they go, the kind

* On doing the arithmetic, however, I find the necessary concentration absurdly great, showing that such a mass is quite insufficient.

of undulation, and the facility with which they go through vacuum, forbid this.

So clearly and universally has it been perceived that waves must be waves of something—something distinct from ordinary matter—that Lord Salisbury, in his presidential address to the British Association at Oxford, criticised the ether as little more than a nominative case to the verb to undulate. It is truly *that*, though it is also truly more than that; but to illustrate that luminiferous aspect of it, I will quote a paragraph from the lecture of Clerk Maxwell's to which I have already referred:—

"The vast interplanetary and interstellar regions will no longer be regarded as waste places in the universe, which the Creator has not seen fit to fill with the symbols of the manifold order of His Kingdom. We shall find them to be already full of this wonderful medium; so full that no human power can remove it from the smallest portion of space, or produce the slightest flaw in its infinite continuity. It extends unbroken from star to star; and when a molecule of hydrogen vibrates in the dog-star, the medium receives the impulses of these vibrations, and after carrying them in its immense bosom for several years, delivers them, in due course, regular order, and full tale, into the spectroscope of Mr. Huggins, at Tulse Hill."

(It is pleasant to remember that those veteran investigators, Sir William and Lady Huggins, are still at work.)

This will suffice to emphasise the fact that the eye is truly an ethereal sense-organ—the only one which we possess, the only mode by which the ether is enabled to appeal to us—and that the detection of tremors in this medium—the perception of the direction in which they go, and some inference as to the quality of the object which has emitted them—cover all that we mean by "sight" and "seeing."

I pass then to another function, the electric and magnetic phenomena displayed by the ether; and on this I will only permit myself a very short quotation from the writings of Faraday, whose whole life may be said to have been directed towards a better understanding of these ethereous phenomena. He is, indeed, the discoverer of the electric and magnetic properties of the ether of space.

Faraday conjectured that the same medium which is concerned in the propagation of light might also be the agent in electromagnetic phenomena. "For my own part," he says, "considering the relation of a vacuum to the magnetic force, and the general character of magnetic phenomena external to the magnet, I am much more inclined to the notion that in the transmission of the force there is such an action, external to the magnet, than that the effects are merely attraction and repulsion at a distance. Such an action may be a function of the æther; for it is not unlikely that, if there be an æther, it should have other uses than simply the conveyance of radiation."

This conjecture has been amply strengthened by subsequent investigations.

One more function is now being discovered; the ether is being found to constitute matter—an immensely interesting topic, on which there are many active workers at the present time. I will make a brief quotation from Professor J. J. Thomson, where he summarises his own anticipation of the conclusion which in one form or another we all see looming before us, though it has not yet been completely attained, and would not by all be similarly expressed:—

“The *whole* mass of any body is just the mass of ether surrounding the body which is carried along by the Faraday tubes associated with the atoms of the body. In fact, all mass is mass of the ether; all momentum, momentum of the ether; and all kinetic energy, kinetic energy of the ether. This view, it should be said, requires the density of the ether to be immensely greater than that of any known substance.”

Yes, far denser—so dense that matter by comparison is like gossamer, or a filmy imperceptible mist, or a milky way. Not unreal or unimportant: a cobweb is not unreal, nor to certain creatures is it unimportant, but it cannot be said to be massive or dense; and matter, even platinum, is not dense when compared with the ether.

Not till last year, however, did I realise what the density of the ether must really be,* compared with that modification of it which appeals to our senses as matter, and which, for that reason, engrosses our attention. I will return to this part of the subject directly.

Is there any other function possessed by the ether, which, though not yet discovered, may lie within the bounds of possibility for future discovery? I believe there is, but it is too speculative to refer to, beyond saying that it has been urged as probable by the authors of “The Unseen Universe,” and has been tentatively referred to by Clerk Maxwell thus:—

“Whether this vast homogeneous expanse of isotropic matter is fitted not only to be a medium of physical interaction between distant bodies, and to fulfil other physical functions of which, perhaps, we have as yet no conception, but also . . . to constitute the material organism of beings exercising functions of life and mind as high or higher than ours are at present—is a question far transcending the limits of physical speculation.”

And there for the present I leave that aspect of the subject.

I shall now attempt to illustrate some relations between ether and matter.

The question is often asked: is ether material? That is largely a question of words and convenience. Undoubtedly the ether belongs to the material or physical universe; but it is not ordinary matter. I

* See the “Philosophical Magazine” for April, 1907.

should prefer to say it is not "matter" at all. It may be the substance or substratum or material of which matter is composed, but it would be confusing and inconvenient not to be able to discriminate between matter on the one hand, and ether on the other. If you tie a knot on a bit of string, the knot is composed of string, but the string is not composed of knots. If you have a smoke or vortex-ring in the air, the vortex-ring is made of air, but the atmosphere is not a vortex-ring; and it would be only confusing to say that it was.

The essential distinction between matter and ether is that matter *moves*, in the sense that it has the property of locomotion and can effect impact and bombardment; while ether is *strained*, and has the property of exerting stress and recoil. All potential energy exists in the ether. It may vibrate, and it may rotate, but as regards locomotion it is stationary—the most stationary body we know—absolutely stationary, so to speak; our standard of rest.

All that we ourselves can effect, in the material universe, is to alter the motion and configuration of masses of matter; we can move matter, by our muscles, and that is all we can do directly: everything else is indirect. This is worth thinking over by those who have not already realised the fact.

But now comes the question, how is it possible for matter to be composed of ether? How is it possible for a solid to be made out of fluid? A solid possesses the properties of rigidity, impenetrability, elasticity, and such like; how can these be imitated by a perfect fluid such as the ether must be? The answer is, they can be imitated by a fluid in motion; a statement which we make with confidence as the result of a great part of Lord Kelvin's work.

It may be illustrated by a few experiments.

A wheel of spokes, transparent or permeable when stationary, becomes opaque when revolving, so that a ball thrown against it does not go through, but rebounds. The motion only affects permeability to matter; transparency to light is unaffected.

A silk cord hanging from a pulley becomes rigid and viscous when put into rapid motion; and pulses or waves which may be generated on the cord travel along it with a speed equal to its own velocity, whatever that velocity may be, so that they appear very nearly to stand still. This is a case of kinetic rigidity; and the fact that the wave-transmission velocity is equal to the rotatory speed of the material, is typical and important, for in all cases of kinetic elasticity these two velocities are of the same order of magnitude.

A flexible chain, set spinning, can stand up on end while the motion continues.

A jet of water at sufficient speed can be struck with a hammer, and resists being cut with a sword.

A spinning disc of paper becomes elastic like flexible metal, and can act like a circular saw. Sir William White tells me that in

naval construction, steel plates are cut by a rapidly-revolving disc of soft iron.

A vortex-ring, ejected from an elliptical orifice, oscillates about the stable circular form, as an indiarubber ring would do; thus furnishing a beautiful example of kinetic elasticity, and showing us clearly a fluid displaying some of the properties of a solid.

A still further example is Lord Kelvin's model of a spring balance, made of nothing but rigid bodies in spinning motion. See his "Popular Lectures and Addresses," vol. 1, p. 239, being his "Address to Section A. of the British Association" in 1884 at Montreal.

If the ether can be set spinning, therefore, we may have some hope of making it imitate the properties of matter, or even of constructing matter by its aid. But how are we to spin the ether? Matter alone seems to have no grip of it. I have spun steel discs, a yard in diameter, 4,000 times a minute, have sent light round and round between them, and tested carefully for the slightest effect on the ether. Not the slightest effect was perceptible. We cannot spin ether mechanically.

But we can vibrate it electrically; and every source of radiation does that. An electrified body, in sufficiently rapid vibration, is the only source of ether-waves that we know; and if an electric charge is suddenly stopped, it generates the pulses known as X-rays, as the result of the collision. Not speed, but sudden change of speed, is the necessary condition for generating waves in the ether by electricity.

We can also, it is believed, infer some kind of rotary motion in the ether; though we have no such obvious means of detecting the spin as is furnished by vision for detecting some kinds of vibration. It is supposed to exist whenever we put a charge into the neighbourhood of a magnetic pole. Round the line joining the two, the ether is spinning like a top. I do not say it is spinning fast: that is a question of its density; it is, in fact, spinning with excessive slowness, but it is spinning with a definite moment of momentum. J. J. Thomson's theory makes its moment of momentum exactly equal to em , the product of charge and pole; the charge being measured electrostatically and the pole magnetically.

How can this be shown experimentally? Suppose we had a spinning top enclosed in a case, so that the spin was unrecognisable by ordinary means, it could be detected by its gyrostatic behaviour to force. If allowed to "precess" it will respond by moving perpendicularly to a deflecting force. So it is with the charge and the magnetic pole. Try to move either suddenly, and it immediately sets off at right angles to the force. A moving charge is a current, and the pole and the current try to revolve round one another—a true gyrostatic action due to the otherwise unrecognisable etherial spin. The fact of such magnetic rotation was discovered by Faraday.

I know that it is usually worked out in another way, in terms of lines of force and the rest of the circuit; but I am thinking of a current as a stream of projected charges; and no one way of regarding such a matter is likely to exhaust the truth, or to exclude other modes which are equally valid. Anyhow, in whatever way it is regarded, it is an example of the three rectangular vectors.

The three vectors at right angles to each other, which may be labelled Current, Magnetism, and Motion respectively, or more generally E., H., and V., represent the quite fundamental relation between ether and matter, and constitute the link between Electricity, Magnetism and Mechanics. Where any two of these are present, the third is a necessary consequence. This principle is the basis of all dynamos, of electric motors, of light, of telegraphy, and of most other things. Indeed, it is a question whether it does not underlie everything that we know in the whole of the physical sciences; and whether it is not the basis of our conception of the three dimensions of space.

Lastly, we have the fundamental property of matter called inertia, which, if I had time, I would show could be explained electro-magnetically, provided the ethereal density is granted as of the order 10^{14} grammes per cubic centimetre. The elasticity of the ether would then have to be of the order 10^7 c.g.s.; and if this is due to intrinsic turbulence, the speed of the whirling or rotational elasticity must be of the same order as the velocity of light. This follows hydrodynamically; in the same sort of way as the speed at which a pulse travelling on a flexible running endless cord, whose tension is entirely due to the centrifugal force of the motion, is precisely equal to the velocity of the cord itself. And so, on our present view, the intrinsic energy of constitution of the ether is incredibly and portentously great; every cubic millimetre of space possessing what, if it were matter, would be a mass of a thousand tons, and an energy equivalent to the output of a million horse-power station for 40 million years.

The universe we are living in is an extraordinary one; and our investigation of it has only just begun. We know that matter has a psychical significance, since it can constitute *brain*, which links together the physical and the psychical worlds. If anyone thinks that the ether, with all its massiveness and energy, has probably no psychical significance, I find myself unable to agree with him

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS CONCERNING DENSITY OF ETHER.

I observe that it is surmised by at least one thoughtful and friendly critic that in speaking of the immense density or massiveness of ether, and the absurdly small density or specific gravity of gross matter by comparison, I intended to signify that matter is a *rarefaction* of the ether. That, however, was not my intention. The view I advocate is that the ether is a perfect *continuum*, an absolute *plenum*, and that, therefore, no local rarefaction is possible. The ether inside matter is

just as dense as the ether outside, and no denser. A material unit—say an electron—is only a peculiarity or singularity of some kind in the ether itself, which is of perfectly uniform density everywhere. What we sense as matter is an aggregate or grouping of an enormous number of such units.

How, then, can we say that matter is millions of times rarer or less substantial than the ether of which it is essentially composed? Those who feel any difficulty here should bethink themselves of what they mean by the average or aggregate density of any discontinuous system, such as a powder, or a gas, or a precipitate, or a snowstorm, or a cloud, or a milky way.

Lord Kelvin has estimated and, indeed, proved that the aggregate density of the whole material cosmos within recognisable gravitational reach of us must be infinitesimal; in other words, that the amount of matter in space, however prodigious it may be, must be infinitely less than the volume of space it occupies. And even of the visible cosmos—that is to say, of the material clustering within reach of our aided organs of vision—the density, though certainly not infinitesimal, is exceedingly small.

It may be clearer if I give some actual numbers. Lord Kelvin estimated the amount of matter within reach of the largest telescopes—say within a parallax of $\frac{1}{1000}$ second of arc, corresponding to a radius of 3×10^{16} kilometres—as equivalent to a thousand million of our suns; that is to say, to a total mass of 1.5×10^{36} tons distributed through a volume of 1.12×10^{39} cubic metres. So the density of the visible cosmos comes out of the order 10^{-3} of that of water.

The masses themselves seem likely to be in the main distinctly of greater density than water; but grouped, or in the aggregate, they are excessively “rare”—far rarer than the residual gas in the highest known vacuum. The whole visible cosmos is, in fact, as much rarer than what we call a high vacuum (say, the hundred-millionth of an atmosphere) as that vacuum is rarer than lead. If it be urged that it is unfair to compare an obviously discrete assemblage like the stars, with an apparently continuous substance like air or lead, the answer is that it is entirely and accurately fair; since air, and every other known form of matter, is essentially an aggregate of particles, and since it is always their average density that we mean. We do not even know for certain their individual atomic density.

The phrase, “specific gravity or density of a powder” is ambiguous. It may mean the specific gravity of the dry powder as it lies, like snow; or it may mean the specific gravity of the particles of which it is composed, like ice.

So also with regard to the density of matter, we might mean the density of the fundamental material of which its units are made—which would be ether; or we might, and in practice do, mean the density of the aggregate lump which we can see and handle; that is to say, of water, or iron, or lead, as the case may be.

In saying that the density of matter is small, I mean, of course, in this last, the usual, sense. In saying that the density of ether is great, I mean that the actual stuff of which these highly-porous aggregates are composed is of immense, of well-nigh incredible density. It is only another way of saying that the ultimate units of matter are few and far between, *i.e.*, that they are excessively small as compared with the distances between them; just as the planets of the solar system, or worlds in the sky, are few and far between—the intervening distances being enormous as compared with the portions of space actually occupied by lumps of matter.

Here it may be noted that it is possible to argue that the density of a *continuum* is necessarily greater than the density of any disconnected aggregate: certainly of any assemblage whose particles are actually composed of the material of the *continuum*. Because the former is "all there," everywhere, without break or intermittence of any kind; while the latter has gaps in it—it is here, and there, but not everywhere.

Indeed, this very argument was used long ago by that notable genius, Robert Hooke; and I quote a passage which Professor Poynting has discovered in his collected posthumous works, and kindly copied out for me:—

"As for *matter*, that I conceive in its essence to be immutable, and "its essence being expatiation determinate, it cannot be altered in "its quantity, either by condensation or rarefaction; that is, there "cannot be more or less of that power or reality, whatever it be, "within the same expatiation or content; but every equal expatiation contains, is filled, or is an equal quantity of *materia*; and "the densest or heaviest, or most powerful body in the world, contains "no more *materia* than that which we conceive to be the rarest, "thinnest, lightest, or least powerful body of all; as gold, for instance, and *æther*, or the substance that fills the cavity of an "exhausted vessel, or cavity of the glass of a barometer above the "quicksilver. Nay, as I shall afterwards prove, this cavity is more "full, or a more dense body of *æther*, in the common sense or acceptance of the word, than gold is of gold, bulk for bulk; and that because "the one, *viz.*, the mass of *æther*, is all *æther*: but the mass of gold, "which we conceive, is not all gold; but there is an inter-mixture, "and that vastly more than is commonly supposed, of *æther* with "it; so that vacuity, as it is commonly thought, or erroneously "supposed, is a more dense body than the gold as gold. But if we "consider the whole content of the one with that of the other, within "the same or equal quantity of expatiation, then are they both equally "containing the *materia* or body."^{*}

^{*} From the *Posthumous Works of Robert Hooke, M.D., F.R.S.*, 1705, pp. 171-2 (as copied in "*Memoir of Dalton*," by Angus Smith).

Newton's contemporaries do not shine in facility and clearness of expression, as he himself did, but Professor Poynting interprets the above singular attempt at utterance thus:—"All space is filled with equally dense *materia*. Gold fills only a small fraction of the space assigned to it, and yet has a big mass. How much greater must be the total mass filling that space!"

The tacit assumption here made is that the particles of the aggregate are all composed of one and the same continuous substance—practically that matter is made of ether; and that assumption, in Hooke's day, must have been only a speculation. But it is the kind of speculation which time is justifying—it is the kind of truth which we all feel to be in process of establishment now.

We do not depend on that sort of argument, however; what we depend on is experimental measure of the mass, and mathematical estimate of the volume, of the electron. For calculation shows that however the mass be accounted for, whether electrostatically or magnetically, or hydrodynamically, the estimate of ratio of mass to effective volume can differ only in a numerical coefficient, and cannot differ as regards order of magnitude. The only way out of this conclusion would be the discovery that the negative electron is not the real or the main matter-unit, but is only a subsidiary ingredient, whereas the main mass is the more bulky positive charge. That last hypothesis, however, is at present too vague to be useful. Moreover, the mass of such a charge would in that case go unexplained, and would need a further step; which would probably land us in much the same sort of ethereal density as is involved in the estimate which I have based on the more familiar and tractable negative electron.

It may be said, why assume any finite density for the ether at all? Why not assume that, as it is infinitely continuous, so it is infinitely dense—whatever that may mean—and that all its properties are infinite?

This might be possible were it not for the velocity of light. By transmitting waves at a finite and measurable speed, the ether has given itself away, and has let in all the possibilities of calculation and numerical statement. Its properties are thereby exhibited as essentially finite—however infinite the whole extent of it may turn out to be.

OLIVER LODGE.

THE VILLAGE "PUB."

THE love of strong drink and the love of consuming it socially are instincts which seem to be coæval with mankind. Go back as far as you will, there is no getting beyond them. Just so the student of Natural History may trace the horse backward through the centuries till he leaves him at last wandering wild over the steppes of Tartary, the same in every material respect as he is at this moment, but apparently playing no more important part in the scheme of creation than the zebra of the African prairie. And so horses might have stayed to this day had it not occurred to some enterprising Aryan that there was money in their domestication. Whence, what R. L. Stevenson calls—"a number of things." Their diffusion and multiplication is not due to any irrepressibility of their own, but to their being a source of profit to breeders and dealers. And so it is with the alcoholic instinct. It is a far cry from Cana of Galilee to a gin palace. There is little in common between the occasion when "Willie brewed a peck o' maut, and Rab and Allan cam to pree," and the joyless horrors of the streets of Glasgow. Feasting covers but a fraction of human life. Nature sets a bound to thirst and gauges very effectually the fluids used for its satisfaction. No healthy man ever drank spirits and water, half and half, by way of quenching his *thirst*. Alcoholic instinct and neighbourly festivity, left to themselves, would never have justified the serious assertion that "Drink is throttling England." It is only because the two have been developed and exploited by scientific method in the interest of human greed that they have become dangerous to the social organism. Let us try to get a concrete notion of the *modus operandi* by studying what I may call the alcoholic cultivation of a country village.

Father Hugh Benson, in his recent romance, "Lord of the World," supposes the existence of a man of prodigious intellectual powers used for the establishment of a world-wide domination. Personally passionless, he is void of scruple as Nature herself. A city stands in his way. He annihilates it. The frenzied rage of a mob is to his

interest. He stimulates it. He is so great that he has all but inverted the entire moral code of mankind, when — He is, in fact, Antichrist.

Imagine our national liquor-system as centred in and radiating from a single person. The familiar saying that a company "has neither a soul to be saved nor a body to be kicked" must apply to him as embodying the irresponsibility which is of the essence of commercial association. His whole ethical system is condensed in the Logion of the supreme authority to which his entire existence is one single act of practical homage. "Do ye therefore what pays you best." He has no temptation to be mealy-mouthed, because the ideas of Good and Evil do not exist for him. He says plainly, in plain words, what he means. Let us listen to him as he instructs a new employé in the duties of the charge upon which he is about to enter. Before him is a map of England, in which he indicates a particular village.

"Here, Mr. Spigot, is your farm. Its area is 500 souls, all with an inborn propensity to drink. You pay so much to me for the privilege of making as much more out of it as you can—just like any other farmer. It seems to you at first sight that this does not leave you more than a bare livelihood. But, as in other occupations, much depends upon your own skill and energy. The normal yield of a piece of land is insignificant compared with what it will produce in the hands of a market-gardener. The drink-habit is one that can be fostered to a degree varying, of course, with individuals, but in all cases going far beyond mere natural need or even inclination. I will indicate generally for your guidance the methods usually found most successful. To make your house attractive is, of course, the first essential. Your own manner must radiate welcome. The presence of women, and especially of young women, is always alluring. Make things pleasant for them. Get lads to bring in their sweethearts for a whisky and lemonade. Dancing and singing are a help. But you must be cautious in this respect. The respectability of your establishment must not be compromised. Betting and gambling, though they make a house popular with a very paying class, are too dangerous to be encouraged. But men connected in any way with the turf should be induced to make your bar their resort. Their conversation has a fascination for rustics. Your tact must instruct you to what point to tolerate the language and conversation prevalent among them. The character of being strait-laced is not one which it is desirable to gain. The same is true of intoxication, especially of a noisy and violent sort. To take the policeman into the confidence of your difficulties in this respect is highly politic. Make him a friend. Be firm in suppressing fights and quarrels. They not only get a house a bad name, but also interfere with that steady consumption of

"liquor which is the mainstay of your business. The 'tuppence-a-night' man, who will sit dry for hours, is an insidious foe not to be attacked openly. A popular house generally counts among its *habitués* a moral chucker-out, whose sneers will effect what you must take care not to do for yourself. Deprecate his interference, and you will have the satisfaction of seeing him supported by the company. 'Scores' are a subject to be treated in the same spirit. A good-natured liberality in this respect will enlist the sympathies of your customers on your side. A defaulter will rather see his children hungry than expose himself to the contempt of his mates.

"The reputation of being good-natured, of having a personal enjoyment in seeing people happy and at their ease, is one of your main assets. Generosity must be stimulated in every way. The more numerous the events that can be made a subject for celebration the better for trade. A man is going to the war. He must have a 'send-off.' He returns. It is a shame to give him a dry welcome. A wedding deserves a carouse, and if the happy pair will help to drink their own healths so much the better. Something can be done even with a christening. The public is the place where every one may participate in the 'joy of eventful living.' Those who stay away soon become pariahs. Be careful not to express dislike of such men. 'Poor Jones' and a laugh is quite enough. Few hold out. Cricket in a village is disadvantageous if the *game* is popular among young rustics. Practice of a summer evening carries off customers. Cricket *matches* are profitable. A visiting team is both thirsty and generous. Matches are for young farmers, tradesmen, curates, and the like, who have brought their skill from school, and do not personally patronise the public. The intelligent publican will say that he likes to see the old village well represented in the cricket field by men like Mr. — and Mr. —, and will treat a victory as a local triumph. Football is less objectionable. It may be supported unreservedly.

"You should always show the greatest respect to the clergy. Attend divine worship, regularly but not to excess, and set your face openly against free talk on religious subjects. Do not take what the vicar says in the pulpit too seriously. He means no harm. The Church has no notion of really 'biting the hand that feeds her.' If you show him proper deference personally he will soon look upon you as a friend and supporter. Your attitude in politics must, of course, be governed by the directions you receive from me, but your personal bearing may be modified by local circumstances. Your popularity need never be compromised. A jolly indifference to blue or yellow may pay in one place, a bluff and hearty partisanship in another. 'What I say is, there are good fellows on both sides.' Or else, 'As long as I'm master in this bar, every man who comes in for a glass shall

"have civil treatment. I don't care which side he is. But as for myself, ~~my~~ colour is blue, and I don't mind who knows it.' Self-assertion is essential to success. A landlord should be a personage in the village. The character of being 'a character' is useful. The publican who can exchange a jolly joke with hunting men who stop at his door for a glass, will be an oracle among young labourers. Flatter the schoolmaster by frequent reference to his high character and his business abilities. Look in on him pretty often, if he gives you any encouragement to do so, and let your intimacy be matter of common knowledge. The great object is to secure the young, the harvest of the future. The law prevents any immediate action in this direction, and it is therefore important that they should learn to look forward betimes to the moment of their emancipation from prohibitive restraint. Church and school, if judiciously treated, will rather help than hinder. Private cordiality far outweighs official denunciation.

"Food is cheaper now than it was. Wages are considerably higher. It must be your object to divert this affluence from its natural channel into your till. Your great rival is, of course, The Family. Every penny spent in increasing the comforts of the home is not merely an immediate loss to yourself, but a source of future danger. It is the squalor of the cottage that drives men to the public. Marriage frequently occasions a temporary desertion, but the first conjugal difference will probably bring your customer back, 'just for one evening,' and if the balance of comfort is on your side, he will afterwards regard your house as a harbour of refuge. It is in this way that the steady, respectable, married soaker is formed. *Habitués* of this sort give you popularity with employers of labour. The public is a sluice that carries off the flood-water of discontent before it reaches the protest point, the point at which labourers 'make themselves nasty' about repairs or sanitation. Comfort at home, especially if it is comfort that can be progressively increased by the husband's own exertions, is the deadly enemy of the public-house habit. The labourer's liability to eviction at short notice is a mainstay of your business. The home, in some cases, becomes only an annexe of the 'pub,' and the mother learns to take her place in the tap-room with a baby in her arms. Women are your natural enemies. To add them to the number of your supporters is to advance the frontier of my dominion.

"If you act in this spirit, Mr. Spigot, I have little doubt that in a few years you will have materially increased the consumption of my liquor in your village, with most gratifying results both to ME and to yourself. The more my revenue is augmented by your exertions the higher will be the social standing of 'The Trade.' My power is already enormous. My benefactions to the Church are immense. Her organs of utterance are clogged by my gold. My

"political support will speedily command whatever price I choose to put upon it. I have already mastered 'Society,' that great Mafia before which Reform is cowed and submits. It will soon be better, socially, to be a criminal than to be a total abstainer. I have enchained the masses. I do not see from what quarter effectual opposition to my supremacy is to come. I am, practically, LORD OF THE WORLD."

I cannot see that this advice contains anything that can be honestly disavowed by the liquor interest at large. Perfection in a publican is as hard to find as it is elsewhere. Few will perhaps conform to *all* these precepts of conduct. Here and there you will find one who has a disinterested liking for village cricket, or who is at daggers drawn with the parson, or who discourages the constant joviality that comes of emulous "treating." Such a man has probably mistaken his vocation. He might do very well as the Boniface of a village inn owned by himself, but not as the tenant of a "tied house." Business is business, and success and failure are so evenly matched that few tradesmen can afford to give even a pawn in the game.

In the foregoing pages I have only considered two parties to the contest between alcohol and humanity, the publican with his living to make and the villager off whom he has to make it. The former naturally pushes his attack with all the *Ulan* that comes of need and the desire of success. The defence of the latter is apt to be lukewarm under any circumstances. But if we introduce active competition which puts the drink-seller on his mettle on one side, and substitute dislike for the support and sympathy that the other might naturally expect to receive from the official representative of religion in his parish on the other, the result can scarcely be doubtful. Liquor will almost invariably carry the day.

Now I am going to quote literally from the report of a meeting held in the Marlborough Town Hall, on the 16th of last March, to protest against Mr. Asquith's Licensing Bill. Among the speakers was the vicar of a neighbouring parish, a man of some prominence in clerical circles, sufficiently at home upon a platform not to be carried beyond his sober judgment by oratorical excitement. I quote his utterances as illustrative of the attitude of the Church of England in a typical country village.

If the Licensing Bill became law, he said there would grow up Drinking Clubs in villages—"in place of the respectable publican—and there were respectable publicans—there were four or five in the village of Burbage, who, he believed, were conducting their trade in a perfectly upright and straightforward manner." Observing that the Government seemed fond of the figure 7, and now, "getting a little bit frightened," were going to extend the time limit of 14 years to 21, he said that "he would advise the licensed victuallers to stick to the matter, and have no time limit except seventy

"times seven." "He believed the real way to promote temperance was to educate the young that liquor was a thing that could be used, but not abused." "He quite agreed that liquor, on no account, should be given to children, and he thought that young men and women would perhaps be better without it." He also quoted Archbishop Magee's assertion that "he would rather see England free than England made sober by Act of Parliament."

Now it is fair to suppose that the vicar does not desire any one of the four or five respectable publicans in Burbage to become bankrupt. Yet it is clear that they can barely exist by their trade unless his parishioners drink a good deal more than (let us say) thirst requires. Hungry competition must exist among them, and can take no other form than that of increasing the pressure to drink. What would be the position of a labourer in that parish, a Churchman, who might sincerely believe, as many good men do, that strong drink is an evil *per se*. If he teaches his children to think as he does, he goes directly in the teeth of the publicly-proclaimed opinions of the vicar, to some of whose "best friends" he is naturally an object of dislike, as depriving them of what they are encouraged to regard as their legitimate share of his earnings.

It may reasonably be said that this is an individual case, and that the speaker I have quoted does not represent the general attitude of the clergy towards Drink. It is rather, I think, a *prominent* case, implying a wide, though unseen, basis of similar opinion. I will give an instance. Some six years ago a temperance meeting was held in the Town Hall of Marlborough, under the auspices of a much respected Mayor. No Church of England clergyman was present. (This was also the case at a temperance meeting held on the same day as that on which the vicar of Burbage was making the speech from which I have just quoted.) At this meeting a resolution was passed, condemning the giving of spirits by liquor sellers as prizes to the Volunteers at their Christmas shooting. The practice, I think, has been long felt to be a mistake, and was at once discontinued. Protest on the part of the clergy of the town would have stopped it at any time. But such a protest would have risked the *entente cordiale* existing between the Church and the Trade. It was never made.

The attitude of the Archbishop of Canterbury might seem to indicate a different feeling on the part of the clergy towards the Licensing Bill. My opinion may be said to be founded rather on local than general observation. Well, the recent meeting of protest against the Licensing Bill at Marlborough was followed immediately by another at the neighbouring town of Hungerford, the vicar of the place and other local clergy being present. The vicar referred to the Licensing Bill as even more "monstrous" than the "monstrous" Bill of Mr. McKenna, and said that "those who had protested against the

"Education Bill could not do less than protest against this assault upon 'the rights, not of a trade only, but of the people at large.'" The vicar of Burbage then repeated much the same views as he had previously expressed at Marlborough, with the addition that he "would not be pulled by the nose by any Archbishop." This declaration was received with "loud cheers," and did not produce any protest whatever from the other clergy present. Few clergymen would, perhaps, consider it expedient to make themselves personally as conspicuous as these gentlemen in their opposition to the views assumed to be held by the Primate. But there is little doubt as to the direction in which they use their local influence. It may be noticed that no clergy, although specially invited, were present at the temperance meeting, presided over by Lord Carrington, which was held at High Wycombe on April 3rd. It is probably believed by the more moderate among them that it is the Archbishop's purpose to introduce, if possible, such modifications into Mr. Asquith's measure as may prevent a rupture between the Church and "The Trade." And to express openly at present anything like sympathy with the Temperance Party would merely gain them ill-will with the publicans in their parishes, which might be avoided by judiciously lying-to until the wind from Lambeth has settled into its true direction.

It is difficult not to feel with indignation that the conduct of the country clergy generally in this all-important crisis seems to be governed rather by a consideration of the interests of The Church than of the poor among whom they live. They feel that the fate of the Education Bill depends very largely upon the attitude of the Church with regard to the Licensing Bill. The Church has practically received the ultimatum of Drink on the subject. She stands now at the parting of the ways.

Personally, I feel with the deepest conviction that there is hardly any evil from which our rural population suffers that is not, directly or indirectly, traceable to the domination of Drink in country villages. Blindness and deafness are the only conditions that make it possible for any grown person in England to be ignorant of the horrors resulting from the excessive use of alcoholic liquor. And yet we allow Capital to post in every village men whose livelihood depends upon their keeping the poor constantly upon the very verge of such excessive use. There is literally no margin left. The steady soaker who gives no trouble to his master, or to the publican, or to the magistrate, may be called the least objectionable product of the system. The money that should have been spent on the clothes or the food of his family goes into the publican's till. It is a personal matter, so to speak. But this desirable result is rarely obtained without outbreaks during what we may call the process of subjugation of the wild beast of alcohol. What form do these outbreaks take? Well, women are pretty usually the first sufferers. I heard of one

only the day before yesterday who has cancer in the lower part of her body, brought on by a peculiarly hellish kick from her husband. Explanation: "He was drunk." *She* is dying in indescribable agonies in a workhouse. You may probably find *him* at the bar of a public casting his mite into the treasury of Drink. Few people who have lived long in country villages but can tell of families of which the jail, the workhouse, and the asylum have each taken their separate toll. Explanation: Drink. The most hopeful are the most in danger. I have known workmen whose abilities were such as would certainly have raised them to positions of extensive usefulness. When they seemed already out of its reach, Drink clutched at their skirts and dragged them down again to sawdust and spittoons. Take any village. You will hardly find a cottage that within the compass of a generation has not "paid its teind to hell," has not seen some inmate sink into the slough of liquor. How is it possible that it should be otherwise? Professional tempters are authorised to drive their traffic at every corner, and it is only through the revenue derived from their success that the mighty masters of "The Trade" are able to make their lordly donations to Church or Charity. Is it wonderful, then, that the public-house should receive the support of the clergy, or, at least, have nothing to fear from antagonism on their part?

The vicar of Burbage said at Hungerford that "some of the "publicans in his village were his best friends." He commented upon the hardship of the publican's being "spied upon by every "sanctimonious creature who walked by his house." What is the labourer's way to his vicar's approbation? To "walk by" the public-house or to enter it?

The fact is notorious. "The Trade" is an ally upon whose support the Church can count, and for whose goodwill she pays by her toleration of what is, *par excellence*, the Curse of Rural England.

D. C. PEDDER.

THE FUNCTION OF MODERN ART CRITICISM.

THE function of criticism, we often hear, is to explain and analyse, to help us to appreciate and savour what has been already produced rather than to produce something fresh. Nothing ever came out of criticism; the critical faculty must follow the creative, it cannot precede it. These are common sayings, and if we look to the great creative epochs of the past they seem to be justified,—at least one does not gather that the great Greek creative epoch, or the Renaissance epoch, was accompanied by any adequately vigorous and profound philosophy of criticism. Criticism came afterwards, when the creative faculty had shown the way, and proceeded to analyse and explain what had been done; but certainly it did not initiate nor even direct and superintend either movement. We must allow due weight to these precedents, but they do not in themselves decide the question. The mere fact that the creative faculty, in the periods of its highest activity in the past, has proceeded on its own intuition and without aid from the critical faculty is not in itself proof positive that it must always proceed so. Suppose it were shown that circumstances during the Greek and Renaissance movements were such as necessarily to keep before the eye of art one fixed and definite standpoint, and, moreover, were such as to impose certain salutary restrictions and limitations, so that it was impossible for the artist to wander into exuberance and redundancy, then it might not seem unaccountable that those movements should have developed in the way they did, with such coherence and sense of purpose, even though they had no conscious critical reasoning to aid them. And if it could be shown that in our day these circumstances were changed, that the fixed and definite standpoint was swept away and the salutary restrictions and limitations removed, so that these influences operated no longer towards the evolution of an art epoch; then we might, perhaps, come to see the critical faculty in a new light. We might

come to see in it the substitute, the natural and only possible substitute, for circumstances which in earlier civilisations had built up the greatest eras of creative art. We might come to see in it a means of inculcating, in the form of a rational theory, the discipline and stability of purpose which those vanished circumstances once imposed automatically.

It is the peculiarity of modern art that to an entire doubt as to its own aims and principles it unites an extraordinarily highly-developed gift of manual dexterity and great technical knowledge. It can paint or carve anything it likes exactly in the manner it likes; at the same time it does not know in the least what to paint or carve, or with what purpose to paint or carve it. This combination of a practised and fluent hand with a vaguely groping and distracted mind is comparatively new in the history of art. Its consequences have only been realised since the successful pre-Raphaelite revolt against authority and law let loose upon us the whole flood of a hitherto controlled and organised dexterity. At the same time the conjunction is a natural one, for the very possession of unlimited powers of execution is bound to render the task of evolving a sound and authoritative theory of art in some ways more difficult. In the rise of an art, when its attempts to express life are attended by a very slowly-yielding ignorance of how to express anything at all, and by a total lack of fluency and facility in execution, this very ignorance and lack of fluency are a safeguard to it. They keep it in the right way because they insure that all subjects and objects delineated shall be such as possess unusual importance and significance, such as strike the artists' attention with peculiar and reiterated force, and which it is worth making a determined effort to portray. In this way a slowly-moving and laborious art is driven by its own shortcomings to practise methods of selection. It is saved from the accidental and the trivial, from distracting detail and meaningless superfluity, not because it knows better than to yield to their solicitations, but because it does not possess the skill to depict such things. It goes right because it cannot go wrong. Throughout the earlier stages at least of the Greek epoch, as throughout the Renaissance, it is very apparent that sculptor and painter are steadied and kept to a certain path because this is their easiest course. They do not wander, they do not indulge in those individual eccentricities and whims which effectually disperse the force of a creative movement, simply because they cannot. The hand has not acquired the facility of execution which will permit of the representation of such slight themes.

If the reader will glance at the course of Italian painting from Giotto to Raphael, he will easily perceive how the most fruitful and powerful tradition in Christian art was shepherded for generations by the ignorance and lack of dexterity of its practitioners. The

development of painting in Italy keeps pace with the development of the intellectual faculty. It has its rise in the first movement of intellect; and as intellect moves on step by step, widening the range of its observation and interest, so painting moves hand in hand with it, recording its conquests, and in its own artistic progress registering the intellectual progress of the age. The limitations in early Renaissance painting are limitations in intellectual development. They stand for the, as yet, dark places of the mind and chronicle the steps of a transition from a state of intellectual indifference to a state of complete intellectual sensibility.

This mental transition and the degrees by which it is accomplished are the governing factors in Renaissance art. A "great intellectual awakening," as we call the Renaissance, implies an aroused consciousness of the character, form and substance of things. It substitutes for the vague acceptance of appearances common to the pre-intellectual age an active examination of structure and contents, and for indefinite emotions definite ideas. "Moving about in worlds not realised" may express the mental attitude of a pre-intellectual age; to realise the world is the task of intellect.

And in the carrying out of this task mind and eye work together and constantly act and re-act upon each other. He who looks at things with the eye of intellect sees them with a new precision and accuracy. He is driven by the intellect itself so to see them. Intent on probing into the nature of things, on divining their purpose and composition, and whence they came and whither they are going, and a thousand other facts about them, the intellect must needs in all these matters employ the eye to collect data for it, and this in turn results in a new discernment and discriminative power imparted to the sense of sight. So that the desires of the mind to distinguish accurately and define exactly grow by degrees into unconscious properties of vision, and *seeing with the mind*, as it may be called, becomes seeing in a new and more positive sense of the word.

One main effect, then, of that great intellectual awakening which we date from the Renaissance was that it taught men to see in the intellectual way, with a new exactitude and discrimination, and with a suddenly enhanced comprehension of the reality of what they looked at. But we are not to suppose that the intellectual awakening itself came all at once. Men did not get up one fine morning and gaze about them with a full-fledged curiosity which embraced equally all objects in view. No, the awakening came gradually, and step by step. It challenged the most obviously interesting and important things first, and by degrees extended its survey to others more remote. Now the most obviously interesting and important thing to mankind is man. Accordingly it is upon man that dawning intellectual curiosity first concentrates its attention. Man's aspect and appearance, the motives of his conduct, the causes of his

happiness or unhappiness, his past history and future fate, the evil or beneficent influences that attend upon him, these are the questions which the conscious attention that springs from intellect first proceeds to examine. Love of human intercourse and delight in human society are the most attractive characteristics of what, for this reason, has been well called the *Humanist* movement. As a matter of mental culture and thought, this centrality of man gave a definite point of view to the intellectualism of the Renaissance. The importance and significance of all objects were calculated in terms of human relationship. Those things which partook intimately of the human lot were more important; those which remotely affected it were less important; while those which were so far removed as to be apparently cut off from it altogether were devoid of any importance or significance whatever.

This is the course of development followed by the Renaissance intellectually. Man was the source of interest, and things outside man derived their interest from the closeness of their connection with him. Moreover, this interest was conferred in several well-marked degrees of intensity. After man himself, the next in order of things that conscious attention begins to investigate is man's own handiwork; everything man has made and constructed and is daily making and constructing, his clothes and jewels, his pots and pans, his utensils and ornaments, his churches and palaces, all these things the newly-awakened curiosity begins to turn over and examine, eager to comprehend their laws of construction, and analyse their adaptability to their several ends. This is the first step, and then, after a considerable pause, awakened curiosity finds time to turn from man and man's creations to the nature around him. First it reaches out to those features which form what we call tame nature, the nature of gardens and pleasure grounds, closely bound up with the daily habits of men; and then it goes on slowly and tentatively to deal with remoter objects and certain aspects of wild nature. Anyone even cursorily acquainted with the Renaissance will recognise these stages in its progress. He will agree that man himself is the centre and source of interest of the whole movement; that from this centre interest overflowed first on to man's creations, taking effect in the many-sided activity in art and craftsmanship we are all so familiar with, and next to that humanised side of nature which could be associated with pleasant society and culture and the walks and talks of scholars. A society which identifies man as its centre and source of interest is bound to follow these lines of development, and indeed in the series of expansions through which it moved, Italian intellectualism was only following the earlier intellectual culture of the Greeks.

Now this intellectual expansion, with its gradual conquests and ordered motion, is what determines the course of Renaissance painting. The capacity to represent figures and objects and landscapes

as they are, to transfer their miniature appearance to canvas, is an intellectual capacity. We spoke just now of that sharpening of the sight, that sense of exact and conscious scrutiny, which the awakened mind bestows upon the eye. This it is which confers the power of natural representation, for to draw things as they are requires that realisation of their appearance and structure which only intellectual comprehension gives. This is a statement which we can easily verify. The broad and general difference between Eastern and Western life is that the former, however richly endowed with emotional qualities, lacks the Western intellectualism. The whole civilisation of the East is comparatively deficient in the practical, logical, rational characteristics of the West. The contrast between Western and Eastern politics, Western and Eastern governments, Western and Eastern history, Western and Eastern literature and learning and science is that the former all show powerful traces of the rule of intellect, whereas the latter do not. This is a fact so placarded across the face of the universe as not, I think, to admit of question. Now glance through Oriental art and observe how the effects of this intellectual want make themselves felt. Look at the groups and animals and landscapes, but more especially at the human figures, in Chinese art, in Japanese art, in Indian art, in Persian art, and in the old art of Egypt and Assyria. The same disability links them all together, a lack, namely, of the power of natural representation. I am aware of the slight qualifications which have to be introduced to this general statement, and that here and there in regard to certain objects or animals the power of natural representation has been attained by Orientals. But in the main the statement is true. Incapable of natural representation, the Oriental is driven to suggest the originals by arbitrary formulas and conventions, perpetually reiterated and arranged, much as a child might arrange them who was ignorant of foreshortening and perspective, in flat detachment like the pattern on a wall paper. This naïve and unreal character, running all through Oriental art, opposes the whole mass of it to the whole mass of Western art, which reproduces things as they actually appear. No doubt the rudiments of vision are the same in an Oriental as in a European, but the Oriental is not conscious of *how* he sees. He does not see with the brain; that keen, analytical quality of sight which arises, as we said, from the eye being used as an instrument of the intellect, is absent from his vision; and the consequence is that the power of natural representation is absent from his art. These two—intellectual development and the power of natural representation—are indissoluble. Whenever and wherever a race exhibits in its life and literature the marks of intellectual capacity, its art will exhibit knowledge of natural representation. Whenever and wherever a race fails in intellectual power, however great its progress along emotional lines, it will fail in art

to represent naturally. You can only get out of art what life puts into it. The contribution of intellect is not to be found in Oriental art because it is not to be found in Oriental life.

The power then to reproduce a thing pictorially in its real likeness depends upon an intellectual realisation of it. We shall not be able to draw and paint it correctly until we have that realisation; but as soon as we attain to such a realisation we shall be able to draw and paint it. Now the awakening of intellect, as was pointed out, came by degrees; therefore, since the power to draw rightly depends on intellect, that, too, must come by degrees. The awakening intellect extended itself in successive, more or less definable, radiations from man, its source and centre, to man's handiwork, from man's handiwork to familiar and domesticated nature, and finally to more remote and wilder nature. The power to draw rightly must follow the same lines of development.

It should be easy to show, in brief outline, that it did so. So long as the Byzantine tradition lasts, nothing, not even the figures, is realised intellectually. The attitudes, stiff and angular, are not real attitudes. The long cadaverous faces are not real faces. The reiteration of the same stereotyped features allies such treatment with the Oriental in all ages. Intellect has not got hold of the subject matter of these drawings. It is before the awakening. Ere the thirteenth century is out, however, there are signs of the approaching change. These first occur in the figures, which begin to break their flat, hieroglyphical postures and come to life. They soon appear in various attitudes instead of always in the same attitude, they are of various types instead of always the same type, and the faces express various intelligible human emotions instead of no emotions at all. They move and act, stiffly it is true and within a very limited range of movement; still the consciousness of their real nature begins to stir in them. It is, I cannot help remarking, for one who looks upon art as the expression of life, the most touching and pathetic movement in the whole of her history. Of all discoveries none ever brought in such immediate, rich results as the discovery of man by man. The interest of man, of the motives, emotions and ideas that stir his mind, that change, and are to be traced in, the expression of his face, that prompt the appropriate postures of his body and gestures of his limbs, all this, the intimate, intellectual consciousness of all this, is the new stimulus which the mind of the age is applying to the eye. It is a time of extraordinarily keen delight in human fellowship and intercourse, a time when the pleasures of society begin to be first consciously felt and then to be cultivated and enhanced. A new ideal of life and manners, a new comprehension and power of sympathy, a new gentleness and urbanity are coming into being. We conceive the youth of the Renaissance gazing at each other with eyes in which

delight and a dawning recognition are dispelling the old insensibility. Such was the gaze by which the Oriental emaciations of Byzantine art were roused to life. "Those are not real cheeks; real cheeks are round and ruddy. Those are not real eyes, nor that a real body, nor are those limbs and hands and feet real." Thus the artist felt; but before he, as spokesman of his age, felt it, what a new power of observation must have come into men's eyes, and with how hitherto unfelt a desire to appreciate the significance and beauty of faces and forms and expression and gestures must men and women in those days have begun to gaze at each other!

This is the first step. Man lives for man in real life, and forthwith man begins to live for the artist on his canvas. But not much else lives. For the most part the blank cold background, blotting out all save the figures, still meets the claims of the universe with a blank negation. Soon, however, interest spreads. The works of men's hands form, as we said, the next sphere it is to conquer, and of such works that which far eclipsed all others in the estimation of citizens so proud of the civic dignity and grandeur of their several cities as the Italians, was necessarily architecture. From the earliest days of the Renaissance, architecture, as must be the case in all great epochs of art, was the pursuit and industry which most engaged attention, and the new spirit that thenceforth began to animate this art is peculiarly characteristic of the change of mental attitude of the age. It is true that the enthusiasm which backed up the nameless Gothic architects and master masons was at least as powerful and universal as that which encouraged Brunelleschi or Bramante. But the important thing to notice is that the character of the two enthusiasms is totally different. The mediæval enthusiasm is emotional, the Renaissance enthusiasm intellectual. The Gothic cathedrals grew spontaneously as unpremeditated, unreasoned expressions of feeling and temperament. The Renaissance buildings are carefully adjusted, logical structures, planned to produce intentional effects of symmetry or grandeur. Whether they produce those effects need not be considered; all we have to observe is that, with the Renaissance, we come all at once to a reasoning, self-conscious, self-analysing style of architecture, a style which sets itself to handle and examine intellectually the problems contained in the art.

Architecture, then, was the branch of man's handiwork which, in the Renaissance age, especially attracted the intellectual interest which alone makes a thing realisable and paintable to the artist.

Accordingly it is the subject in which, after the figures, painting makes most decisive and earliest progress. Before the thirteenth century is out architectural accessories are introduced as a setting to the awakening figures. They are invariably executed with a new care and closeness of attention, the mouldings and details being

drawn with fastidious precision, while the character of the structure is fully realised and rendered. It is, indeed, often over-realised, and with too complete a consciousness of the function and formation of columns, architraves and cornices; the consequence being that buildings, in Renaissance painting generally, are apt to assert themselves too vigorously and with something of the harsh exactitude of an architect's plans. So enamoured is the artist of the intellectual interest of this subject that he cannot deny himself the pleasure of articulating every detail of it. More, he cannot help introducing it even amongst the most incongruous surroundings. Stately pleasure domes or classic temples must start up in the wilderness, or be perched on inaccessible crags; and the crib at Bethlehem must be sheltered by a Corinthian pediment.

And what renders the strength and realism of the architectural drawing the more remarkable is that the scenes amid which it commonly occurs are, as regards their natural features, rendered, at first, with an entire and, later, with a partial lack of comprehension. The eye turns from some difficult, elaborate structure, a triumph of realistic painting, to a river indicated by parallel white lines and some fish cruising about on the surface, or to a foreground of a dull, whitish grey, in texture neither soil nor rock, but of the nature, apparently, of pipe-clay, or to certain shapeless peaks in the background of the same white clay as the foreground, with two or three trees, in make and shape like enormous black toad-stools, poised on their summits. It would not be possible to have marked for us more clearly the limits to which intellectual realisation had reached. On the one side of those limits all is life and accuracy, on the other all is dull insensibility and images without character or life. The awakening intellect has realised figures and has realised buildings, but rivers and rocks, the common earth and mountain peaks, it has not realised at all. In the representation of these features certain formulæ are reiterated and acquiesced in with almost the apathy of the old Byzantine days. The stratification of rock, the outcrops of ledges, the ripples on water, the shapes of clouds and many other natural objects are indicated by conventions which are repeated quite in the Oriental spirit for centuries. Progress in these regions remote from humanity was slow. Even so penetrative a genius as Leonardo never came to perceive that the savage rocks possessed a character of their own and structural laws of their own, which made them worthy of being painted, and which needed realisation if they were to be painted properly. He had never looked at rocks with the eye of intellect, and he painted them accordingly as if they had been made of cheese.

But if progress, in dealing with scenes of wild nature, is slow, it is much more rapid in the rendering of domesticated or tame nature. The coloured flower-heads that peeped from the grass at man's

feet, the trees, symmetrical and cultured, which grew around their villas, or tempted them by their promise of cool shade to ascend the gentle eminence on which they stood, these were the artists' first subjects; and it is with these as with the architecture,—no sooner is attention once turned upon them than they are rendered with a perfect articulation of leaf and petal which testifies to the new comprehension which has suddenly seized upon them. But still the limit of intellectual realisation, the point it has attained to but beyond which it cannot yet penetrate, though pushed back a step, remains clearly marked; for while the surrounding shrubs and flowers are wrought with a perfect delicacy of discrimination, the hills and earth are pipe-clay still, and the rocks mere shapeless dumplings. The old suddenness of transition from knowledge to ignorance remains. As a man standing in the heart of a mist sees the vapour lift and recoil, uncovering by degrees the nearer objects while still obstructing the remote, so is it with the intellectual range, and so with the artistic capacity of the Renaissance. Man; man plus architecture and clothes; man plus architecture and clothes plus a few flowers and trees; man plus architecture and clothes, plus a few flowers and trees, plus an enlarging area gradually extending to things remote, but never quite mastering the absolutely wild,—these are the degrees of enlightenment. From man as the centre of all interest intellectual realisation proceeds, and as it proceeds, working outwards, first one set of objects and then another is comprehended, rendered definable, and so brought within the grasp of the artist. Thus most Renaissance pictures—all of them which comprise a sufficiently wide range of subject matter—are to some extent shared between knowledge and ignorance. How far knowledge has got, to what extent it has penetrated the whole picture, will, of course, depend chiefly on the period at which the work was painted; but until the ascending movement comes to an end and art begins to decline into anarchy, there remain always moods of nature not realised, not paintable; and so in every work of adequate range the limit of intellectual realisation will be distinctly apparent. Once let this idea be entertained and the reader will find, as he walks through the rooms of the National Gallery, that his eye will easily learn to distinguish the intellectual range of most of the works. For example, in "The Nativity," by Luca Signorelli, the figures, attitudes, faces, expressions, movements are all free and expressive; the little flowers and herbs and grasses in the foreground are exquisitely realised and reproduced; the temple in the middle distance is drawn with the most determined correctness, as also are the battlements and towers of the town on the hill; but the crags and rocky declivities which form the greater part of the composition are not in the least like natural stones and cliffs, but are merely the perpetuation of certain dull formulæ accepted as signifying the real

things by artists whose comprehension had never grasped their actual appearances. A still more conspicuous example of the same limitation is Mantegna's "Agony in the Garden," in which the figures, near and distant, are drawn with easy mastery, in which, too, the white Jerusalem walls and towers, and all the delicate architecture of the city are elaborated with exquisite accuracy, yet in which the wild peaks and rocky landscape are executed with a complete and child-like unconsciousness of their real character.

Nor can it be maintained in explanation of such limitations that the capacity of Renaissance art progressed from the more easy to the more difficult. On the contrary the reverse is rather the case. The success achieved is in inverse proportion to the ease in achieving it. Of all subjects the human form, with its infinite variety of gesture and expression, dependent on minute inflections in drawing, is the most difficult to master; after figures, architecture, with its complex perspective and the demand it makes on exactitude of line, is the next most difficult, while when we come to nature, the trees and flowers of the foreground are certainly much harder to render than the wilder and remoter features of the landscape. Any student of water-colour painting at the present day could draw a wild landscape with a truth which no painter of the Renaissance could have rivalled; and it would be only as he approached the more difficult features in composition that he would find Renaissance art forging ahead of him. The cause of success or failure, in the case of Renaissance art, does not therefore lie in ease or difficulty of execution. It is to be found rather in the fact that as we make the transition from wild nature to tame, from tame nature to man's handiwork, and from man's handiwork to man, we are moving from the outskirts of a circle towards the centre of it, which is man himself, and consequently, with every step we take, the appeal to human interest increases in power and intensity. This human interest it is, this power, as I have called it, of intellectually realising the object looked at, which is the proper clue to the progress made. Let intellect catch hold, let it inform the eye with its desire for penetrating, measuring, defining, and whether the thing looked at be difficult or easy to draw the artist will soon learn to draw it. Let intellect fail to catch hold, fail to direct the eye, and though the object be comparatively easy to represent, he will find himself helpless before it.

I think it will be felt that art thus regarded, thus watched as it tracks the mind, throws some light on the psychological aspect of the Renaissance. We know the fascination of that epoch. It marks the emergence, after long eclipse, of a faculty destined to assert in our own times an almost unquestioned despotism over the mind. Any means which make the mind of that age more realisable to us, therefore—which help us

to trace and follow the movements of the new faculty, to observe in what directions it first assays its powers, and in what manner and with what results it makes its influence felt—must needs be of importance. And if once we conceive artistic activity as based on intellectual, we have at once a visible clue to the whole intellectual development. We have, for example, the dominating position of Florence defined with a new clearness. In the case of several schools of art, analysed by Mr. Berenson in his lately-published "Northern Painters," it is apparent that the Florentine influence is always the fruitful and progressive one, and that motives derived from other sources always tend to sterility. This will seem natural enough if we recognise that artistic progress was made possible by intellectual progress, for there is no question for a moment of Florence's intellectual supremacy. What the Renaissance, as a whole, did for art was to turn it into a vehicle for the expression of intellectualised life, and it was because Florence led the way in matters of intellect that she led the way in matters of art. Side by side at the rise of the new epoch stand the two great Florentine figures of Dante and Giotto, like a pair of mountain springs, from which the twin rivers of literature and art flow down to the valleys and the plain; dealing, both of them, with the more momentous issues of man's fate, and dealing with them with that new, unmistakable and terrible force of intellectual realisation of which they were the first appointed instruments. Down from Dante stretches a line of poets and prose writers whose study is still man, but who develop by degrees a more and more familiar and mundane intimacy with their subject; while down from Giotto stretch the Renaissance painters, pursuing a like course, and handling by degrees more familiarly all the circumstances of human life. The literary impulse thus given is to end in the minute realisations of the modern novel. The artistic impulse thus given is to end in the correspondingly minute realisations of modern painting. But the two, at every stage of their development, are inseparable, for they both alike result from the intellect's widening survey or closer scrutiny.

But although, this being the case, we might, as, indeed, we generally do, approach our subject from the literary point of view, and perhaps from several other points of view besides, yet I cannot help doubting whether any of these methods of study, or all combined, would give us the same vivid perception of the course followed by the movement as is to be gained from painting. Does one reader in fifty realise the meaning of that dull phrase of ours, "the awakening of the intellect," which we have repeated till it has become a mere formula? Does one reader in fifty realise it as an active process, with tangible results and methods, and a regular scheme of development of its own? I venture to doubt if an historical, political, or literary study of the subject could endow it with such a living interest. But consider it in relation to the view of painting that has been suggested. Watch

the operation of the new faculty touching into life, like a magic wand, the figures and countenances of men and women; thence moving on to things most soaked with human interest, and so by degrees to others more removed. Watch the mental activity thus rendered visible, creeping and spreading from stage to stage, giving realism to each thing as it reaches and grasps it. Does not such a manifestation of its activity, thus laid on the canvas before our eyes, quicken our old phrase with a new meaning, and enable us to realise the intellectual awakening as a vital process.

And now will the reader consider our own case and the depth of the difference between Renaissance art and ours? The old limitations no longer in these days exist. So completely has the modern mind become intellectualised, and so completely has it intellectualised the eye, that the modern artist can paint anything. Not wild nature only, throwing it all, just as it is, upon the canvas, and not all the daily incidents and moments of human life only, fugitive glimpses seen one minute and gone the next, yet caught with the extraordinarily swift intellectual perception of modern sight—not these things only can the artist of to-day paint, but atmospheric effects of shadows, and reflections, and mists; of sunbeams in the air and upon the leaves and grass—effects so aerial and evanescent that they seem scarcely palpable to sight itself. The change would seem all in favour of ourselves. Instead of being able to deal only with a very limited range of subjects, modern art can, deal with, can realise, the universe. Its sphere of interest and its sphere of capacity are alike indefinitely enlarged, and in this sense the task which Renaissance art set out to accomplish, the task of converting painting into an adequate vehicle for the expression of intellectualised life, may be said to have been achieved. But there is something to set against this. Our facility in representation, our miscellaneous and universal range of interest, threaten us with pitfalls from which Renaissance art was exempt. The man who can draw but little, and that little all from the same point of view, cannot widely err. The man who can draw anything from any point of view is liable to infinite error. There might be no great occasion to preach the need of selection and the evils of redundancy to an artist who could paint only a bunch of cyclamen, a praying saint and an acacia tree; but how widely different does the case become when we have to do with artists who can paint rocks and dew, and the tangle of woods and street crowds, and 'buses and hansoms, and all the motley panorama and topsy-turvydom of natural and human life all over the world!

This is the difference that puts modern criticism on a new footing. Instinctively we look to the Renaissance, the greatest creative epoch in painting of Christian times, for instruction and guidance in the art. We do so because we feel that the coherence, significance and simplicity of that art are the essential qualifications for all effective

art, that all art is effective only in so far as it possesses these qualities, and that our own art must somehow or other attain to them if it is ever to express anything at all with clearness and power. Doubtless we are right. The qualities of Renaissance art are the qualities of great art in all ages, and we cannot too clearly recognise it. But also we cannot too clearly understand that it is impossible for us to attain to these qualities by the road by which the Italians attained to them. We have lost the old human centralisation and the strict limitations in executive range of Renaissance art which were such safeguards, which forced coherence, significance, and simplicity on their generation, so that that generation could do without a thoughtful and sound critical theory of art. Those safeguards and restraints have vanished. Nothing any longer forces coherence, significance and simplicity upon us, and therefore we cannot do without a thoughtful and sound critical theory of art. We who know enough to go wrong must know enough to go right. If the reader would realise how grave a peril facility of execution, unguided and unrestrained, may become, he has but to glance around at the anarchy and confusion which have everywhere invaded the domain of art. Never were energy and activity in that domain so universal as at present, yet never was the direction which all this energy and activity should take more obscure. One knows not whether to marvel most at the volume of the yearly output which this energy is responsible for, or at the number of spasmodic and contradictory impulses in which it fritters itself away. Looking down once on to the great cataract south of Wady Halfa, which the Arabs call the "Belly of Stone," I saw below me a vast expanse of scattered boulders among which the water gushed and foamed, spouting in a thousand petty channels, sometimes in this direction, sometimes in that, so that in the chaos and din it was difficult to distinguish any forward movement at all. Never was the progress of water in less proportion to its energy. Voluble yet incoherent, eager yet aimless, of such a kind is the activity which possesses modern art. No one will deny what all lament. The speculation at the back of every mind is, how are we to regain the coherence and simplicity we have lost; how are we to curb and control this terrible dexterity which takes the impress of every random whim with such fatal facility?

Will the art of criticism prove equal to such a task? Intellect, with its realisation of the actual appearance and structure of things, has given us the dexterity; will intellect, pressed further and revealing inward principles of coherence and order, teach us how to curb and control it? I do not mean to suggest that criticism can ever stand us in the stead of creative genius, still less that it can be a substitute for those profound impulses of emotion and faith which unite whole populations in a common endeavour and are the main instruments in the evolution of artistic epochs.

Criticism will never of itself generate a great creative epoch. It may, however, prepare the way for such an epoch, and it may greatly enhance its value when it comes. And in the meantime, while we are still in the experimental stage, it may instil the beginnings of a purpose and a concerted aim into the experiments of the hour by formulating a body of authoritative ideas which may serve as a check on the too facile indulgence in personal vagaries, and suggest to all earnest people the existence of certain assured clues amid the labyrinth of alternatives around them.

This is the task cut out for modern art criticism. The new circumstances under which art is now carried on are forcing every year more peremptorily this duty upon it. To share the enthusiasms of the moment, to follow instead of guiding public opinion, is an easy critical method and one sure of reward, for he will not have to wait long for recognition who supplies us with reasons for liking what we like already. But it is not by such means that criticism will justify its claim to be considered a serious intellectual vocation. That claim it can justify only by shouldering the new responsibility cast upon it and setting itself to build up a code of laws which shall answer the purpose of the old executive limitations in controlling and concentrating the creative faculty.

L. MARCH PHILLIPPS.

ANCIENT WISDOM AND MODERN KNOWLEDGE.

IT is sometimes said that our Western civilisation which we fondly think the greatest and most enduring of all time is nevertheless doomed like its predecessors to decay and disappearance. What right have we to assume that its vitality is greater than that of the august civilisations of the ancient World, of Egypt, of Chaldea, of India?

The two first named have utterly vanished; the third, according to the general notion, lives on chiefly in remains—remains of thought, remains of learning, remains of material splendour. So far as India is concerned there is, indeed, another side to the question; but for the moment we will put it by and pass on to remark that in some directions there are signs which should set us on our guard against supposing that Western civilisation has any claim to superior longevity, far less to immortality,—signs of exhaustion, of repletion, of senility. Were it not for a single factor in the case, we might give up at once as hopeless the notion that it has any other future before it than that of not very greatly postponed decadence and death. This single factor is, however, of such supreme importance and such wide application that it changes the face of the whole matter. It consists in the self-evident fact that Western civilisation has in every region of thought and activity passed beyond the possibility of isolation, and therefore of inanition.

The ancient civilisations were confined within strict limits and consequently foredoomed to death by starvation. Up to a certain pitch, a very high pitch in Egypt and in India, the races which produced them could carry them on, but then the necessity for a revivifying process began to make itself felt. The old ideals and methods were to some extent used up. They needed to be supplemented, extended, in certain respects superseded. The originating

race was unable to supply these requirements, and the lack of inter-communication prevented the accession of fresh thought and experience from without, save in such small amounts as were quite ineffectual for the purpose. Younger and independent civilisations grew up and fought the old. The old went down before them, bequeathing, indeed, some of their treasures to their conquerors, but only a comparatively small part, for the latter were too alien in thought and manner of life, too isolated themselves, to profit by, even to any considerable extent to preserve, the rich inheritance which might have been theirs. So they, too, carried the seeds of death within themselves, and after flourishing for awhile, went the way of their predecessors.

Such, outlined with extreme brevity, is the history of the ancient civilisations, and it needs no very great mental acumen to perceive that such cannot be the history of our own. Names and places and centres may, indeed, supersede one another, but as a whole this civilisation is as bound to live on as others have been bound to perish. The motto appropriate to it is that of Shelley's cloud: "I change, but I cannot die," and for the same reason, viz., that while it gives out its life it is also drawing into itself from the human universe, as the cloud from the physical universe, the revivifying and regenerating elements of which it stands in need.

There is, perhaps, no direction in which this principle is more clearly seen at work than in the assimilation and modification by extreme Western thought of the ancient wisdom of the East, more especially of India, the treasures of whose literature and tradition are being increasingly opened up and studied.

Lecky, in his "Map of Life," has pointed out with much conciseness a fundamental difference between East and West. "It is eminently 'characteristic of Eastern Nations,' he says, 'to place their ideals 'mainly in states of mind or feeling rather than in changes of circumstances, and in such nations men are much less desirous than in European countries of altering the permanent conditions of their lives.'" Yet, as he observes a few pages later, "a discontent with existing circumstances is the chief source of a desire to improve them, and this desire is the mainspring of progress, of progress not only in material but in moral and spiritual conditions. The rôle of 'Divine Discontent' is one we cannot afford to do without."

The restless and progressive West has been and is pre-eminently discontented, whether always divinely so may be open to doubt. For the most part there has been an admixture of elements to which the epithet is not usually applied. The result is certainly seen in immense "changes of circumstances," of which the two most important, from our present point of view, are the enormous facility of inter-communication and interchange of thought as compared with any previous era in the world's history, and the unequalled power of

preserving and handing on the acquirements and discoveries of science, art and literature.

All this progress, however, is, to use a favourite modern term, "on the objective plane." It is the genius of the West to work on that plane, to regard the visible and tangible universe as more substantial and more valuable than the world within, the domain of mind and spirit. In consequence Western culture and intellect have passed in an extraordinary degree under the dominion of the senses, and the material order has become no better than a prison house walled in by space and time, on which we look not as one of our latter-day prophets would have us, as "inverse measures of the force of the "soul,"* but as rigid and insurmountable barriers. Until recently (apart from certain rare and splendid exceptions) there has been no sign that we were otherwise than wholly contented with, even proud of, our self-imposed restrictions. Now the note is changing, and in the uncertainty and tentativeness which characterise transitional periods, the eyes of not a few are turning towards that ancient wisdom of the East, long ignored, long contemned, but the survival of which is in itself a token that its resources have not as yet been fully exploited. Of it may, perhaps, be said what Emerson said of "that source, at once the essence of genius, the essence of virtue and "the essence of life, which we call Spontaneity or Instinct. We "denote this primary wisdom as intuition, whilst all later teachings "are tuitions."

The West has been rich in tuitions, for such are in reality all those teachings which come directly or mediately from the external order of things. The East has held fast to the "primary wisdom," the light which comes from within; and so utterly diverse are the ways of seeing things which have respectively arisen from these opposite standpoints, that many of those who best know the peculiarities of both are the loudest in their assurances that—

"East is east and West is west and never the twain shall meet"

in thought any more than in manner of life. These prophets are wrong, however, for something of a conjunction is even now taking place, and in all truth and justice it must be said that the West, in however blundering and bungling a fashion, has taken the initiative. The East never would have done so, for the East is not dissatisfied with its own method of thought, nor desirous of extending its experience, and the West is,† though in regard to the first item its dissatisfaction is still largely unconscious. That it exists, however, the most cursory acquaintance with the current literature of the day, or with averagely cultured society, is amply sufficient to prove,

* Emerson, "The Over Soul."

† The reader will, of course, understand that these assertions must be taken only in their general significance. There are many individual exceptions which, for the purpose of the present essay, cannot be taken into account.

and one reason for this condition of things lies in the iron bonds within which orthodox modern science endeavours to confine the aspirations, both intellectual and spiritual, of the most inquiring age the world has yet seen. So cramped and stultifying is the outlook it imposes that in very truth there are some people to-day,—there were many more twenty years ago,—who really “appear to think . . . that “all things are searched to the bottom. The effect upon their minds of “scientific discoveries, classifications and vocabularies has been to “induce a foolish sense of comprehensiveness and conquest. . . . Yet “it may seem to profit a man little that he can see through a piece of “wood if he lose his vision beyond it; or that he can do battle with “a stormcloud if he shall lose the spint which breathes in the prayer “of the Breton seaman, ‘Help me, O God, for my barque is so small, “and Thy ocean is so vast,’* in other words the spirit which realises “that the simplicity of nature is not that which may easily be read, “but is inexhaustible.”†

The “primary wisdom” of the East has ever led it to lay stress upon this inexhaustible element, the source of which lies within and not without, so that recognition of it is to be found rather by the road of contemplation than of action. Nevertheless, there is truth in Carlyle’s saying that “the end of man is an Action not a Thought, “be it of the noblest.” It is in the non-recognition of this fact that we find the clue to Eastern inertness. There has been too great willingness to sit still and think, letting outward things take their course, a fault exactly opposite to that of the fussy, practical West, which is for ever intermeddling to set them right.

It seems clear enough that the one method is the complement of the other, and that a systematic combination of the two would be the great initial step towards the highest achievements the worlds of action and of thought have yet seen.

The practical pioneers in the matter are our American cousins, who since they represent the extreme phase of Western civilisation naturally suffer most from its defects. Their way has been prepared by the work of scholarly investigators of all nations, who have placed at the disposal of less well-equipped students the ancient literature of the East, and also by personal intercommunication between living representatives of the best culture of both hemispheres. Thus it has come to pass that the typical up-to-date Westerner perceives a possible remedy for his many physical and spiritual infirmities in a wisdom which recked and recks little of the material prosperity and superficial refinement on which he sets so great store.

For some years past there has been a flood of popular literature, chiefly of American origin, but having a large circulation in this country also, announcing “Easy Lessons in Concentration and

* Prof. Jethro Brown, “The Passing of Conviction,” *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1904.

† Emerson, “Spiritual Law.”

"Healing," "The Mastery of Fate," "Power through Self-Culture," "The Secret of Opulence," "The Conquest of Poverty," etc., etc., etc. All these books and pamphlets insist, with more or less convincingness, on the fact that the source of mental and physical power, and of mastery over external conditions, lies within, not without, the man who seeks it, and purport to give instruction as to the manner in which this mastery is to be attained.

Setting aside Christian Science and Faith-healing manuals, many of these works, especially those of the more responsible and scientific kind,* owe, and acknowledge that they owe, their chief inspiration to the Hindu systems of Yoga. The name will be familiar to all readers. For the benefit of those to whom it is no more than a name, it may be briefly described as a method of aiming at—its followers assert of acquiring—"freedom from the slavery of "matter and thought, mastery of external and internal nature," by self-control of the mind and its powers. It is especially necessary to note that the control must be self-exercised and voluntary. Hypnotism and suggestion by others form no part of Yoga. Of these practices a modern Hindu exponent of Yoga says: "The control of the "[mind and nerve] centres which is established in a hypnotic patient "or the patient of faith-healing for a time, is utterly reprehensible, "because it leads to ultimate ruin. It is not really controlling the "brain-centres by the power of one's own will, but is, as it were, "stunning the patient's mind for a time by sudden blows which "another's mind delivers to it At each one of these processes "the man operated upon loses a part of his mental energies, and at "last the mind, instead of gaining the power of perfect control, "becomes a shapeless, powerless mass, and the only goal of the patient "is the lunatic asylum,"† a different goal indeed to that of the Yogî. He "proposes to himself no less a task than to master the whole "universe, to control the whole of Nature. He wants to arrive at the "point where what we call 'Nature's Laws' will have no influence "over him, where he will be able to get beyond them all. He will be "master of the whole of Nature, internal and external."‡

This, after all, is the aim of modern knowledge as well as of ancient wisdom, only the method is totally different. The *materia* of the Western student consist in the telescope, the microscope, the test-tube, mathematical analysis, and all the refined and marvellous instruments of modern research. He works upon the objective plane. He interprets the laws of his own nature by the laws of the material universe.

The Yogî works upon the subjective plane; he has no use for

* Among these may be mentioned "The History and Power of Mind," by Richard Ingalese, and the "Ars Vivendi" Series, by Arthur Lovell; especially the volume in the latter entitled "Concentration," in which the aphorisms of Pantajali are given for "advanced students."

† "Swami Vivekananda Râja Yoga," p. 64. ‡ Op. cit., p. 11.

telescopes and microscopes. By means of them he cannot discover the mind and its workings. He turns his attention within. He concentrates all his powers upon such physical and mental training as may enable him to dispense with instruments of research and the round-about processes of inductive reasoning. His aim is, not to perfect tuition, but intuition, to attain immediate, not mediate knowledge. "No more will you need to go to books for knowledge; your own mind will have become your book, containing infinite knowledge."*

Now such a claim as this would not long ago have seemed to the educated Western mind the very height of absurdity. Books, indeed, it might have agreed, could to a certain extent be dispensed with, but observation of and investigation into external Nature, never.

The Yogi thinks differently. To him "all this external world is but the gross form of the internal, or subtle The external world is the effect, the internal the cause One who has discovered and learned how to manipulate the internal forces will get the whole of Nature under his control."†

Underlying this conviction is the immovable assurance that mind or soul is superior to body, to the whole physical universe indeed, which is its creature and its servant. Such an assurance has been altogether alien to the habit of thought engendered by orthodox modern science, which is that man is a slave to his own body and his physical environment; and however numerous the individuals—and they are very numerous—who would indignantly disclaim the accusation, there are few who do not acquiesce practically in what they disavow verbally, to whom a physical fact is not the very substance of reality beyond which they cannot get, and are unable to see that it is possible to get. Their very religion is tainted by this (often unconscious) materialism. Otherwise would such discussions and polemic rage round "the physical fact of the Resurrection," or the persistence of life beyond death remain a dim and uncertain hope to be bolstered up by dogmas and creeds? Would not Christians endeavour "to come to the basis of belief, the real genuine religion, to *perceive for themselves* whether they have souls, whether life is "of five minutes or of eternity, whether there is a God in the "Universe, or none?"‡

Some of these possibilities they do, indeed, either receive on authority or endeavour to ascertain, but it is always by the objective method, by historical examination and criticism, by such investigations as those of the Psychical Research Society, by the study of comparative religion, of creeds and rituals. These things have, indeed, their own great sphere of utility, but they are not the direct road. That, according to Rāja Yoga, is "to concentrate the mind, . . . to discover the facts in our own minds . . . to generalise these facts

* "Rāja Yoga," p. 58.

† Op. cit., p. 10.

‡ Op. cit., p. 9.

"and form our own conclusions from them," and it proposes to teach us how to do all this.

To discover the facts in our own minds. Modern psychology also sets this goal before itself, but it goes the same way to work as all the rest of Western science, it looks on the mind from *without*. It therefore gains knowledge about mental processes and states, but it does not and cannot penetrate to their inner significance. Really to "understand" these mental phenomena in the true etymological sense of that word we must get beneath them, we must come into direct contact with the reality of which they are the expression, and that reality belongs to the world within, not without us. With it, consequently, objective science cannot deal. That shows us processes, gives us classifications and sequences, but nothing more. Many of its adherents and exponents have persuaded themselves that there is nothing more, nothing at any rate penetrable to man. This the ancient wisdom emphatically denies. It says that we can, if we choose, penetrate beyond the world of sense and inference, beyond "the tremendous dead wall called reason," and succeed in finding "something higher than [not against] reason," and that this "something higher" is not speculation, or faith, but knowledge, knowledge of the most direct and irrefragable kind.

It is easy to treat this claim with scorn, to point to the wretched condition of the masses of the population in countries where it has been pursued, and where the methods by which it asserts that it can be made good have been followed by a small and select portion of the community to which any benefits accruing from it have been confined. Too much may easily be made of such objections. It is certain that an exclusive pursuit of the subjective method must be attended with its own risks and dangers, different from, but perhaps no worse than, those which characterise the objective. The practical question is not whether the subjective method is perfect,—nothing human is perfect,—but whether it is expedient for the highest welfare of mankind entirely to set it aside as the West has attempted to do. That it has not wholly succeeded in the attempt need hardly be pointed out. All the mystics, all the seers and poets are proof to the contrary, but these, though a certain meed of admiration is accorded to "the divine insanity of noble minds," are not generally accepted as guides and teachers. That place is accorded to chemists, physicists, biologists, anthropologists, *et hoc genus omne*. There are now signs of a very decided reaction, and before it has set in to so full an extent that it is past control, it seems as though an endeavour should be made to ascertain in what direction the stream might be most beneficially turned.

For this purpose the great point of agreement between the subjective and objective methods should be emphasised as fully as their divergences. Both claim to be based on experience, and both

make good their claim. This will not be denied to the objective method. However recondite the theoretical conclusions at which the physicist or the chemist arrives, he takes pride in pointing out that every fact on which those conclusions rest is verifiable to anyone who chooses to take the trouble of putting it to experimental test. To doubters he has but one answer to make: "Try and see," and if the doubter will be at the pains to do so, he finds that the result is precisely what he was told it would be. If further facts come to light, they may and probably will modify,—possibly even reverse,—the interpretation given to previously known facts, and in consequence scientific theory is always in a state of flux. But the student is in no way disconcerted by this; it does not falsify his contention that his science is founded on experience, but means merely that in the light of newly discovered facts he must revise his inferences.

If, however, an investigator according to the subjective method claims to have discovered facts and bases upon them certain conclusions, not only does the objective scientist deny the conclusions, but the facts also. There are not, and cannot be, any such effects produced, he exclaims. The answer is once again: "Try and see." This, as a rule, he refuses to do, and waxes vehement in his denunciation of "folly," "superstition," "charlatanry," and the like. But by what right does he claim the prerogative of denying facts which he will not put to the test? If he is not qualified by temperament or education to pursue investigation by the subjective method, then he is no judge in the matter. As well might an historian arrogate to himself the right to determine the truth or falsity of facts vouched for by the physicist or chemist.

Now the subjective method, equally with the objective, claims to be scientific. It requires its followers to prove every step they take, and test every fact they receive. "The knowledge of the mind, of the internal nature of man, of thought, can never be had until we have the power of first observing the facts that are going on within . . . [but] from our childhood upwards we have been taught only to pay attention to things external, never to pay attention to things internal, and most of us have nearly lost the faculty of observing the internal mechanism. To turn the mind, as it were, inside, stop it from going outside, and then to concentrate all its powers and throw them upon the mind itself, in order that it may know its own nature, analyse itself, is very hard work. Yet that is the only way to anything which will be a scientific approach to the subject."*

Hard and special work requires hard and special training. It does not need very much acumen to perceive that an untrained and undisciplined mind, attempting "to concentrate all its powers and throw them upon itself," would either be compelled to give up the task, or would collapse under its magnitude. We do not trust tyros

* *Rāja Yoga*, p. 7.

in chemistry with the handling of explosive compounds, nor an amateur electrician with the control of dynamos and powerful alternating currents. We know but too well what the consequences would be. The mind is a more dangerous instrument to handle in ignorance than any explosive compounds, and more powerful than the most powerful dynamo. If we will not or cannot train in and for its investigation, let us not attempt it, for that way madness lies. In any branch of knowledge, if we aim at the highest, all must be made subservient to that end. Otherwise we shall most certainly fail to attain it. But just as comparatively few men have the vocation or the power to become great discoverers in objective science, so few are able to be such in subjective science.

It is a matter both of surprise and amusement to realise,—as one seldom does unless a particular instance is forced on one's attention,—the enormous ignorance still prevailing among the large mass of people in the most ordinary matters of accepted science. Certainly by far the larger part of the population in England still firmly believes that the earth is the centre of the solar system. Probably not more than one-fiftieth or even less of the remainder has made any attempt to verify the train of reasoning by which this primitive hypothesis has been proved wrong. A very small minority of Europeans and Americans really know anything whatever of the general principles underlying the marvels of applied science with which their daily lives make them familiar; they are ignorant of most of the facts, even, from which the great generalisations which are the pride of their age are drawn. That does not in the least interfere with their accepting the benefits and conveniences arising from the experimental and inferential genius of the great living masters of the objective method, and they would regard any man who should deny the power of this method as a fool, though they themselves have not put it to the test in these matters, but are merely accepting results.

No fault is found with this attitude of theirs. It is regarded as wholly reasonable. Not every man is called to be a scientific expert; there are other interests in life, other practical pursuits to be followed, and other ends to be gained, than an intimate acquaintance with the physical processes of the universe.

When, however, the same sort of claim to recognition of results is set up by the masters of the subjective method it is denied. Their knowledge is said by Western scientists to be either without foundation,—despite their continued assertion that every step is based on experience,—or valid only for individuals, of no worth to the race at large. Would it indeed be worthless if the fact were regarded as proved that man can "by analysing his own mind come face to face" . . . with something which is never destroyed, something which is "by its own nature eternally pure and perfect"? All religion asserts

that this something exists, all philosophy is the organised search for it. But philosophy is at fault for lack of subjective data, and in religion men make the extraordinary mistake of supposing that its supreme experiences are unverifiable at the present day, that they were only possible in the past, and to a few great teachers.

In consequence, they are fettered by tradition, and even in the case of Christians pin their faith on historical documents, the faintest doubt as to the authenticity of which becomes agony to them, or on an infallible Church, proofs of whose fallibility meet them on every side. Would not trust in present experience be better than this? Would it not be more reasonable to give heed to the statements of those who claim no more authority in their dicta than do the great leaders in modern objective science, who like them obtain unanimity in their results, and like them assert that these results are verifiable by any who will be at the pains to put them to the test. The verification of the highest results demands of course in either case the devotion of the whole life to the one pursuit, and the verification of any results whatever, some care, patience and training, this last being of the special kind required for the special purpose.

In every community some natures will be found apt for training in the subjective method. As a rule we in the West waste these by forcing them into uncongenial and comparatively unfruitful careers, or by leaving them to run to seed over fanciful interpretations of tendencies and experiences, into the true significance of which they might by efficient teaching and discipline have learned to penetrate, and so have become trustworthy guides in their turn.

It is worth while, at any rate, to reflect upon this aspect of the matter. Objective science can never be robbed of the honour which is its due. Without it, the world to-day, badly off as we deem it in some respects, would be infinitely worse off; but objective science is beginning to recognise its limits; it has indeed defined them with very fair precision. Beyond and beneath its domain lies a sphere which it cannot penetrate, but which nevertheless most nearly concerns mankind and into which raids are made from time to time by irresponsible pioneers, who are regarded with more or less discredit because they stumble upon laws of which they do not know the scope or significance, and consequently misapply and abuse them. It is time that an end should be put to this unsatisfactory condition of things, that subjective science, alternately regarded with contempt and superstitious terror, should be given its proper place and its due regard, that it should be allowed, as objective science is allowed, to make use of its own appropriate methods, and be tested by its own appropriate tests, and that the two ways of approaching truth should be seen in their right perspective, as convergent and not divergent.

It is not difficult for the thoughtful mind so to regard them now. After all, it is mental power which builds up the grand results of objective science and which has devised all the marvellous instruments

of research by which those results have been ascertained and applied to practical purposes. Distance is fast becoming a vanishing quantity, and the discovery of wireless telegraphy proves past the possibility of refutation the existence of a medium through which communication can take place between mind and mind with the minimum of material intervention. Telepathy,—which surely by this time may be regarded as an accepted scientific fact,—is the one step further needed to abolish apparent material agency altogether. There seems to be a fairly general consensus of opinion that in reality the same medium, viz., the "ether" on which Lord Salisbury expended a fund of sarcasm in his celebrated speech at the meeting of the British Association in Oxford in 1894, supplies the mechanism both of wireless telegraphy and of telepathy. Subjective scientists claim that it is also the means by which physical and mental impressions are produced "at a distance"—that by its agency those who have acquired sufficient mastery over the usually latent powers of the human mind, and consequently over its physical organs, are able to see, to hear, to touch, to taste and to smell objects which to untrained persons would be entirely beyond the range of sense-perception.

At the stage which objective science has now reached, it is itself within measurable distance of such discoveries as these, and thus of meeting subjective science at its lowest point on common ground.

Emphatically *at its lowest point*; for physical effects, however great and however salutary, can never be the ultimate goal of subjective science. The body must not be an obstruction, therefore it "must be kept healthy; we have to take care of what we eat and drink and what we do; always use a mental effort, what is usually called "Christian Science," to keep the body strong, but that is all. "Nothing further of the body . . . Health is only the means to an end," and that end is to attain voluntarily by tested and appropriate methods direct knowledge of supreme reality, in the language of religion, God.

On the possibility of attaining this end the highest spiritual geniuses are agreed, but they do not always know how they attained it. They know it was not by the ordinary processes of reason, and therefore they suppose it was from without, through some kind of external revelation. Subjective science teaches as Christ taught—that this knowledge, though it is quite truly regarded as beyond reasoning, comes from *within*, not from without. "The kingdom of God is within you." It is possible, however, that instead of knowingly and resolutely attaining this condition "of going beyond reason, transcending ordinary human nature," a man may stumble upon it, just as another man, ignorant of objective science, may light upon some one of its discoveries and roughly apply it after his own fashion. He will attain results, but he will be puzzled by them, and probably misinterpret them. So with metaphysical and

transcendental knowledge. It may sometimes come by chance to a man who does not understand its science, consequently cannot discover its whole significance, but mixes it with superstition and error, to his own danger and the partial deception of his fellows. To achieve certain and beneficial results in subjective science we have, indeed, to transcend what we ordinarily call reason, "but we must do it scientifically, slowly, by regular practice, and we must cast off all "superstition." As with objective science, we must seek not this or that foregone conclusion, not this or that dogma or creed, but truth at all costs. So, and so only, will success attend our efforts. "We must lay our foundation, we must follow reason as far as it leads, "and when reason fails, reason itself will show us the way to the "higher plane. . . . Furthermore this is a most vital point to understand, that inspiration is as much in every man's nature [though "latent in most men] as it was in the ancient prophets. . . . These "were great Yogis. They had gained this superconsciousness and " . . . the very fact that one man ever reached that state proves that "it is possible for every man to do so."*

But such men are spiritual giants. They count no cost, they blench at no renunciation, and such absolute single-heartedness and its rewards are the portion of the few, not the many. For lesser attainments, lesser efforts are necessary. Moderate restraint, moderate endeavour, moderate practice in subjective science lead to moderate self-mastery and its concomitant, a measure of control over external circumstances. "The least done will bring a great amount "of benefit. . . . First of all it will tone down nervous excitement "[that bane of the West], bring calmness, enable us to see things "more clearly. The temperament will be better, the health will be "better," and so the everyday business of life will be conducted in a more tranquil frame of mind. Subservience to the body and the physical environment will be lessened. This is as fully worth aiming at in general education as that greater familiarity with the methods of objective science which its professors are always urging upon us.

Something more than this might advantageously follow upon the recognition of the rightful claim of subjective science to be heard and studied systematically, viz., the acceptance of its results by the rank and file of average culture precisely as the results of objective science are now accepted, *on authority*; authority which can always be put to the test and so turned into experience, but which the greater number of persons prefer to leave as authority. The advantages of this course are patent to all. The world at large would suffer greatly if none were allowed to benefit by the results of objective science except those who were experts in it. A very cursory reflection will make it obvious that because this dictum is

* Rāja Yoga, pp. 78-80. Christ Himself taught, and His first disciples taught, that those who lived in His Name and Strength would grow up to the measure of the fulness of His Spiritual Stature; but modern Christians explain away these sayings.

...d. ...
...thrax, cancer, diabetes, dip...
...ated by the help of experim...
...these diseases, per million pe...
...her diseases, *e.g.*, bronchitis, m...
...which are studied and treated wi...
...animals. The death-rate from these...
...ons living, is going down. "Wherever the...
...or is stretched out over a disease, there that disease increa...
...d upon life, and hurries men faster to the tomb. Whereve...
...the sick ones of the earth have been tended beyond the reach of...
...the vivisector, there, more and more, have the maladies that afflict...
...mankind yielded to the ministrations of the kindly physician."...
Therefore, the world would be better if no experiments on animals...
had ever been made. This argument he supports by instances from...
the Report (1905) of the Registrar-General for England and Wales.
Let us, therefore, examine these instances.

ANTHRAX.

The figures which he gives here have nothing to do with the death-rate per million persons living. They are the total number of deaths in all England and Wales. He has got hold of page 20 of the Report by mistake instead of page 21. The death-rate from anthrax, per million persons living, has never, for the last twenty years, risen above 1. As for anthrax among sheep and cattle, he does not contest the fact that many millions of animals, during the last quarter of a century, have been protected by inoculation, and thereby saved.

* Contemporary Review, April, 1908.

and environm.
"by but to fulfil." Never
down of prejudice, the sweep
ing and modifying almost pa
it dogmas. Christ and the great
this because they *knew*, not by
by experience, that what they taught was
show their followers how to attain the same
and achieve the same results in the same manner. Theref
moved the world; and therefore modern teachers, working
same power and in the same spirit, may also move it if they are
prepared to pay the cost.

Here and there one will be found to do so, or rather one will be
impelled to do so by the power within him. Genius in any direction
is born, not made, and cannot be repressed. But we need not there
fore look with contempt on the rank and file of endeavour and
acquirement. These are as necessary to the spread of the truths
and benefits both of objective and subjective science as the discoveries
of the great leaders themselves. We cannot all be pioneers. The
army of occupation must follow to take possession of the territory
mapped out for it. There is a large amount of territory in the
domain of subjective science waiting for precisely such organised
occupation, and open in the meanwhile to irregular surveys and
irresponsible raids. To bring about a more orderly and profitable
state of things seems a task worthy of the combined efforts of all who
have the highest and most widespread development of mankind at
heart.

EMMA MARIE CAILLARD.

DIABETES.

It cannot be true, he says, if the death-rate, per million persons living, has gone up, that the lives of diabetic patients are prolonged by dieting. But it is true. Sir Lauder Brunton's evidence on this point, before the Royal Commission, merely states what everybody, doctor or no doctor, has known for the last fifty years. "Before Bernard's experiments, we did not in the least know that the amount of sugar that was passing was due to the conversion of starch into sugar: whereas now we know that, and we limit the diet of the diabetic. In this way we can lessen his sufferings and can prolong his life." I am sure that Mr. Coleridge, if he had this malady, would immediately diet himself. He would not go back to the treatment of diabetes in the days before Claude Bernard. Here is an old account of a case, treated at that period, without "the assistance of the vivisectors," but by "the ministrations of the kindly physician":—*Though she was much emaciated, yet her muscular strength did not appear to me to be so far diminished as to forbid the practice of blood-letting. Between the 28th of December and the 14th of January she was bled four times, to the extent of twelve or fourteen ounces each time. She was put, also, on a gentle course of mercury, which after some time slightly affected the mouth; and she was laid under no particular restriction as to diet. I did not find, however, that the smallest impression was made upon the state of the symptoms.*

DIPHTHERIA.

Mr. Coleridge admits that, during the last five years, the death-rate from this disease, per million persons living, "seems somewhat to have decreased." He ought not to use the words *seems* and *somewhat*: for the death-rate has fallen from 272 for 1896-1900 to 204 for 1901-1905. Still, he attributes the heavy death-rate of the earlier years to the use of the antitoxin. "The highest death-rate ever recorded took place in the five years of 1896 to 1900, which synchronises with the spread all over England of the antitoxin treatment."

He knows, of course, that if all the children suffering at this moment with diphtheria could be divided into two equal hosts, fifty per cent. of them treated with antitoxin, and fifty per cent. treated without antitoxin, the vast majority of the fatal cases would be in the second group. He knows, also, the supreme importance of the *immediate* use of the antitoxin, at the very outset of the disease. He knows the table, in the 1904 Report of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, which demonstrates, in a very striking way, the danger of delay in getting the children under the influence of the antitoxin:—

PERCENTAGE MORTALITY ACCORDING TO TIME OF COMING
UNDER TREATMENT.

Number of Cases in the Eight Years.	Day of Disease.	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904
204	First.	0'0	0'0	0'0	0'0	0'0	0'0	0'0	0'0
1278	Second.	5'4	5'0	3'8	3'6	4'1	4'6	4'2	5'43
1374	Third	11'5	14'3	12'2	6'7	11'9	10'5	17'6	10'63
1036	Fourth.	19'0	18'1	20'0	14'9	12'4	19'8	16'7	19'51
1382	Fifth and after.	21'0	22'5	20'4	21'2	18'6	19'4	17'3	13'11

He knows, also, how the antitoxin has brought down the death-rate of those most formidable cases where tracheotomy is necessary. In short, he knows, and, I am sure, he cannot refute, the statement lately made to the Royal Commission by the Director of the Lister Institute:—

"The facts relating to the influence of antitoxin in the treatment of diphtheria may be briefly summarised as follows: (1) Diphtheria can be cured with certainty, in animals, by treatment with antitoxin. (2) The earlier the treatment, the less the quantity required, and the more certain the cure: and, if the administration of antitoxin is delayed beyond a certain time, the treatment is ineffective. Those are the facts as regards animals. (3) A reduction of case-mortality of diphtheria to one-third or one-half occurred universally, coincidently with the introduction of the antitoxin treatment. (4) In many places a corresponding diminution in proportion to population occurred; but in some countries this has been masked by a simultaneous increase in the prevalence of the disease. (5) A similar fall in case-mortality among the severest forms of diphtheria, *viz.*, those necessitating tracheotomy, has been universally experienced: so that the apparent beneficial results of serum-treatment cannot be explained by the supposition that after 1895 a milder form of the disease was suddenly and universally experienced. (6) The beneficial results of serum-treatment are greater, the earlier in the course of the disease the treatment is applied; and after the fourth or fifth day the administration of antitoxin produces little or no influence upon the case-mortality. This is absolutely in accord with what was known of antitoxin from the results of experiments on animals."

Mr. Coleridge speaks of "statistics compiled over small areas or "at particular hospitals by persons anxious to puff a prophylactic "or push a serum." But he knows that the diphtheria-antitoxin has stood the test of incessant use for thirteen years, in private practice no less than hospital practice, all over the world. Finally, he knows that, in the nature of things, diphtheria is more prevalent in one year,

and less in another. Umbrellas do not prevent wet weather, nor do fire-escapes prevent houses from catching fire. Mr. Coleridge's argument against diphtheria-antitoxin is equally valid against umbrellas and fire-escapes.

GLANDERS.

Here he has made the same mistake that he made over anthrax. He has taken page 20 of the Registrar-General's Report, instead of page 21. The death-rate from glanders, per million persons living, for the last twenty years, has never once risen above 0.

TETANUS.

It is true that there has been a marked increase since 1902 in the number of deaths from tetanus; and it is true that the tetanus-antitoxin is much less valuable than the diphtheria-antitoxin. Perhaps, in a few years, the men of science will discover a more efficient tetanus-antitoxin. Meanwhile, if I were seized with acute tetanus, I would have the antitoxin at once, *plus* all other suitable drugs; but I should have very little hope either in it, or in them, or in anything. Still, there is a bright side to the picture. Mr. Coleridge, I am sure, will be glad to be reminded of the fact, already well-known to him, that horses can be immunised, with very remarkable certainty against this dreadful disease:—

As a prophylactic the power of the antitoxin is fully established. In veterinary practice, where it has been used under test conditions, it has proved infallible. The bacillus of tetanus is common in dung, and hence on the skins of horses. A considerable mortality from tetanus occurs in veterinary surgery. Nocard has collected the results of the experience of prophylactic injections gained by 63 veterinary surgeons during a period of 22 months. 2,700 cases, both operative and traumatic, were selected for preventive inoculation from horses in which, by experience, they knew that tetanus was most likely to occur. Not one of these 2,700 animals contracted tetanus; whereas, in the practice of the same veterinary surgeons during the same period, but not so treated, 259 cases of tetanus occurred. *Dr. C. J. Martin's evidence before the Royal Commission.*

Moreover, the general recognition of tetanus as a contagious disease, due to the entry of a specific bacillus into a wound, has had a great deal to do with the prevention of "outbreaks" of the disease. For instance, in one maternity hospital, up to 1882, out of 17,650 babies born within its walls, no less than 2,944 had died of tetanus. "This mortality," Dr. C. J. Martin tells the Commission, "could have been entirely prevented if the cause and means of spread of the infection had been known." Again, in the Franco-German War, tetanus, according to the German statistics, occurred in one-third per cent. of all wounds; but in the South African War only three cases of tetanus occurred. So soon as Carle and Rattone

and Nicolaier had proved, by the inoculation of animals, that tetanus was due to a bacillus of the soil, which could be transferred from wound to wound, the disease began to disappear from hospitals, field-hospitals, and all places where either the infliction of wounds or the after-treatment of them is under the surgeon's control. "The efforts of the vivisectors," says Mr. Coleridge, "would seem to provoke this disease to be more fatal." But, in the American Civil War, there were 505 cases of tetanus; and, in the Franco-German War, in the German army, 1 of every 300 wounded men was attacked by tetanus. Then came "the vivisectors"; and, in the South African War, there were only three cases of the disease.*

DISEASES OF THE THYROID BODY.

Myxoedema and sporadic cretinism are due to loss of the secretion of the thyroid body. The treatment of myxoedema and of sporadic cretinism is by the administration of thyroid extract, which gives to the patient what he fails to manufacture for himself. This treatment was discovered by the help of experiments on animals. Therefore, Mr. Coleridge calls attention to the fact that the death-rate from diseases of the thyroid body is going up. I am sure that he has never seen, either in photographs or in real life, the steady recovery, with the thyroid extract, of human beings who were half-imbecile. If he had, he would not laugh at the doctor's "enthusiasm" for this excellent drug. As for what he says about the death-rate, it is not to the point; for there are many other diseases of the thyroid body, including diverse forms of malignant disease.

Mr. Coleridge now reverses his argument, and gives instances of diseases which have "escaped the attention of the vivisectors," and thereby have become less fatal to the nation.

ATROPHY, DEBILITY.

Atrophy and debility, which the Registrar-General separates by a comma, are to Mr. Coleridge one disease. "This malady," he calls them. These deaths from atrophy and debility are the deaths of infants; and I need not say that the rate of mortality among infants is determined by many influences. Mr. Coleridge puts it to the credit of the medical profession that the death-rate from "atrophy-debility" has gone down. I should have been inclined to put it to the credit of the parents. Anyhow, in the Registrar-General's Report, all deaths from atrophy or debility are classed as deaths from "causes ill-defined or not specified." The words are printed

* It might be said, *per contra*, that the disappearance of tetanus from our hospitals and field-hospitals is due not so much to the recognition of the true cause of that disease as to the use of the antiseptic method. But, as Lord Lister himself has said, "the antiseptic method was based on bacteriology." And, if it had not been for experiments on animals, bacteriology would never have been based on anything.

in italics, thus, *Atrophy, Debility*. And a note is placed in a conspicuous position, at the head of the tables, "The terms printed in italics, being the names of symptoms merely, or being unauthorised or otherwise objectionable, should be used in medical certificates only when precise information is unobtainable."

CONSUMPTION.

The death-rate from consumption, which Mr. Coleridge calls *tuberculosis phthisis*, is going down. He explains this fact by saying that "the vivisectors have abandoned the hunt for a serum ever since the portentous exposure of Professor Koch's tuberculin in 1894." By 1894 he means 1891; by "the hunt for a serum," he means nothing at all. Tuberculin, at the present moment, is widely used, both for the detection and for the treatment of diverse forms of tuberculosis; and with very good results. Ever since Koch's discovery of the tubercle-bacillus (1881), the study of tuberculosis has been, and still is, profoundly influenced by the bacteriologists; and so is the present treatment of consumption. In 1865, Villemin proved that it is an infective disease: he inoculated a few rabbits with tuberculous matter, and produced tubercle in them. In 1881, Koch proved, by the inoculation of animals, that the disease is due to a specific bacillus. So long as it was possible to regard phthisis as a form of "inflammation of the lungs," the disease was treated on lines which are now deserted. In proportion as people—not only the doctors, but everybody—recognised the true nature of the disease, its death-rate went down. Mr. Coleridge says that "the fresh-air treatment needs no vivisected animals to manifest its value." But it was just the old false ideas about phthisis which stood in the way of the present methods of treatment and of prevention. Long after Villemin's experiments, people still refused to believe that phthisis could be a contagious disease, and still kept consumptive patients in warm rooms, or in bed, who now would be up and out in the open air all day long. The open-air treatment comes to us from "the hands of the vivisectors": so do the present tuberculin treatment, and the use of the opsonic index, and the ability to detect early phthisis by finding the bacillus in the sputa, and the knowledge that the sputa may convey the disease: and so do the testing of cows' milk, and the detection of latent tuberculosis in cattle, and the sanitary precautions against the spread of consumption. As Koch says, in the first published account of his discovery of the tubercle-bacillus:—

Henceforth, in our warfare against this fearful scourge of our race, we have to reckon not with a nameless something, but with a definite parasite, whose conditions of life are for the most part already known, and can be further studied. . . . *Before all things, we must shut off the sources of infection, so far as it is in the power of man to do this.*

CONVULSIONS.

"I next come," says Mr. Coleridge, "to convulsions. This (*sic*) "has escaped the attention of the vivisectors, and for the last twenty "years the death-rate has gone steadily down." But convulsions have been very thoroughly studied by the method in question. For instance, the surgical treatment of some cases of epilepsy, and the general recognition of the facts of spinal and cerebral localisation, are due, almost wholly, to experiments on animals. Again, Sir Charles Bell's discovery of the physiological difference between the anterior nerve-roots and the posterior nerve roots was made by the production of convulsive movements. Mr. Coleridge, of course, knows the famous passage in Bell's 1811 pamphlet:—

On laying bare the roots of the spinal nerves, I found that I could cut across the posterior fasciculus of nerves, which took its origin from the posterior portion of the spinal marrow, without convulsing the muscles of the back; but that on touching the anterior fasciculus with the point of the knife, the muscles of the back were immediately convulsed.

Such were my reasons for concluding that the cerebrum and cerebellum were parts distinct in function, and that every nerve possessing a double function obtained that by having a double root. *I now saw the meaning* of the double connection of the nerves with the spinal marrow.

But Mr. Coleridge assumes that the only form of "convulsions" is, that which is called by that name in the Registrar-General's Report. The word there is printed in italics. "It will be noted," says the Registrar-General, "that about one-fourth of the uncertified "cases which were referred to coroners, and rather more than one-half of those which were not so referred, were of infants under three "months of age, and that premature birth, 'convulsions,' or "'debility,' were the assigned causes of most of these deaths." In brief, as medical men become more careful not to return symptoms as causes of death, so fewer infants are reported as having died from "convulsions."

DROPSY.

Dropsy is not, as Mr. Coleridge calls it, a disease. It is a symptom. Its causes have been very thoroughly studied by the help of experiments on animals. (See Prof. Starling's evidence before the Royal Commission.) The word in the Report is printed in italics; and what I have said about the apparent decrease of deaths from "convulsions" applies also to the apparent decrease of deaths from "dropsy."

DYSENTERY.

Mr. Coleridge says that he can find no reference to this disease in the evidence of "the vivisectors" before the Royal Commission.

He will find a whole column about it in the evidence of the Director of the Lister Institute (Q. 11,755-11,759): with a reference to very favourable results obtained by a serum treatment. The present knowledge of dysentery, as a bacterial disease, would have been impossible without the help of experiments on animals.

INFLUENZA.

"Its gradual descent in fatality since its first arrival," says Mr. Coleridge, of influenza, "has fortunately not been interfered with by any efforts on the part of the vivisectors to find a serum and inject it into patients." I will consider only one of the mistakes in this sentence. There has been no gradual descent of fatality of influenza. The death-rate per million persons living leaps up and down, from year to year, in the most amazing way. In 1895, it was 423; next year it was only 122. In 1900, it was terribly high, 504; next year it was 174. "It is to be hoped," says Mr. Coleridge, "that the vivisectors will continue their inattention to this disease, in order that its decrease in mortality may continue uninterrupted." But the mortality of this disease, left to "the ministrations of the kindly physician," in four equidistant years, 1890, 1895, 1900, and 1905, was as follows: 157, 423, 504, and 204.

HYDROPHOBIA.

The reader must be tired of Mr. Coleridge's instances; and this shall be the last. "I have not the means at my disposal," he says, "of investigating the death-rates from this disease in foreign countries." He will find what he wants, in the evidence before the Royal Commission (vol. iii. p. 214). There is a vast amount of official and other statistical information quoted on that page, from Wurtemberg, France, the Department of the Seine, Vienna, Hungary, and Japan. It embodies the results of enquiries made, over a period of fifty years, into the histories of 3,127 people, who were bitten by rabid animals, but none of whom were treated by Pasteur's method. The mortality of these 3,127 cases was 517, or 16.5 per cent. These figures are not selected; they are simply all the obtainable figures as to the chance of death, if a man is bitten by a rabid animal and is not treated betimes at a Pasteur Institute. Mr. Coleridge goes on, "Two facts are indisputable: the first is, that Pasteur Institutes in Paris and elsewhere have entirely failed to prevent people from dying of hydrophobia." But take the patients in Class A. In every case the animal was proved to have been rabid, by the following method: a particle of its spinal cord, taken from its dead body, and inoculated into another animal, reproduced the disease in that animal. Of these patients in Class A, there were treated, in the Paris Institute alone, in the twelve years 1886-1897, no less than

2,872. The mortality was 0.60 per cent. as against 16.5 per cent. "The second (fact) is, that in England, where there are no Pasteur "Institutes, there is at present no hydrophobia." That is true. But the point is, that "the vivisectors" worked with all their might to bring about the Muzzling Order; and the "anti-vivisectionists" opposed it. "The anti-vivisection party," says Sir Victor Horsley, in his evidence before the Royal Commission, "entered upon a "virulent campaign against us, and held meetings, and endeavoured "to show that M. Pasteur's discovery of the real infective nature of "the disease was wrong. . . . I need not weary the Commission, "but I would point out that we obtained partial muzzling in spite "of this opposition, and that that did so much good that then Mr. "Walter Long applied the muzzling and established quarantine." (vol. iv. p. 119.)

For want of room, I will pass over Mr. Coleridge's other instances: I will only say, of typhoid fever, that he confuses the prevention of that disease with its treatment. Now I will give him one or two instances of my own. I will parody his parody, and will maintain that those diseases, which have *not* had "the hand of the vivisector "stretched over them," have become *more* fatal to the nation.

APPENDICITIS.

The treatment of this disease owes nothing to experiments on animals. Its mortality, therefore, according to Mr. Coleridge, ought to be going down. According to the Registrar-General's Report, it is going up. I need not give the figures.

ALCOHOLISM.

Here is another disease which has been left to "the ministrations "of the kindly physician." All the same, the death-rate has gone up, per million persons living, from 56 in the first quinquennial period to 78.2 in the last.

PREMATURE BIRTH.

Nobody will say that any attempt has been made, by experiments on animals, to interfere with the babe unborn. All the same, the death-rate, per million persons living, from premature birth, has gone up swiftly.

CONGENITAL DEFECTS.

There is no serum, either preventive or curative, for congenital malformations. Nevertheless, the death-rate of these afflicted children has gone up. The same is true of the death-rates from injuries at birth, and from want of mother's milk.

Also, the death-rate from scurvy has gone up; and so has the death-rate from otitis; and the death-rate from malaria has gone down. All these instances, and many more, are against Mr. Coleridge. Finally, there has been a most remarkable fall in the number of deaths from "causes ill-defined or not specified." How does Mr. Coleridge explain that fact? For instance, *Sudden Death, cause unascertained*, has fallen steadily and swiftly, from 16 per million living in 1886 to 1 per million in 1905. We cannot give the credit here to the kindly physician. For my part, I am of opinion that the Registrar-General's Report is not so "inevitable" as it appears to Mr. Coleridge; and, if I were permitted to choose my own diseases, I would limit my choice to those which are printed in italics.

I have left to the last what Mr. Coleridge says about cancer. He says that, at present, there is no serum treatment for that disease. Then he says, "At any time, this direct assistance to the fatality of the disease may be begun by the bolder and more sinister of the magicians of the laboratories. Yet it is manifest, that in the meanwhile no effort is spared by them to discredit time-tried melioratives, and to pour contempt upon the beneficent ministrations of clinical physicians, until faith is lost and skill depreciated to the deterioration of the true art of healing, and to the aggravation of the malignity of maladies." He is not serious. It is his humour. You have to keep saying to yourself that he is not serious; he does not mean what he says.

STEPHEN PAGET.

THE WASTE OF DAYLIGHT.

MR. GLADSTONE, in one of his finest flights of oratory, during the debate on the Reform Bill of 1867, repeated the passionate cry of Ajax, and implored his opponents to "destroy him in the daylight"; and ever since the day when God said, "Let there be Light, and there was Light," men have prayed that their darkness might be changed into light. More light and fuller has been their prayer, and twice, and twice only, has it been heard. The ratification of the promise of lengthened days was given to Hezekiah by bringing "again the shadow of the degrees which is gone down in the sun-dial of Ahaz," when "the sun returned ten degrees, by which degrees it was gone down," and again the sun stood still and the moon stayed until Joshua avenged himself upon his enemies in the valley of Ajalon.

These are not the days of visible miracles, though the whole world and all that it contains is one vast miracle; so in a practical age we must endeavour to attain our ends in a practical way. That later hours from sunrise and sunset, from April to September, would yield more sleep to millions and greatly increase for many more millions their opportunities of outdoor recreation there can be no doubt. To attain these beneficent ends, with a concurrent yearly saving in our expenditure on artificial light of £2,500,000, a plan is put forward by Mr. William Willett, whose proposal is that the hour between two o'clock and three o'clock in the morning of each of the first four Sundays in April of each year shall be a short hour, consisting of forty minutes only, and that between two o'clock and three o'clock in the morning of each of the first four Sundays in September shall be a long hour, consisting of eighty minutes.

Alterations in the calendar have already been effected in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and parts of India; and at the Cape standard time has twice recently been advanced—in 1892 by fifteen

minutes and in 1903 by a further thirty minutes, and no disadvantages are known to have arisen in consequence of these changes.

A resident in the Malay States says "that three years ago we adopted Singapore mean-time as a standard, the effect being that we secured some twenty minutes extra daylight throughout the greater part of the year. The change was immediately appreciated by all."

The plan now proposed will not even cause any alteration in our ordinary railway time tables, for the station clocks would be regulated between 2 a.m. and 3 a.m. on Sundays in April at a time of infinitesimal traffic.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the boon that prolonged hours of available daylight would confer on the many thousands of toiling men and women who have passed their days in shops and factories, and only get back to their homes in the twilight of departing day. I suppose it would be impossible to ascertain how many thousand clerks spend their spare time in the cricket-field or on the golf course, or in cycling or on the river; and it would be still more impossible to count the number of those who delight in watching these manly contests. And even to those more advanced in years, who are satisfied to spend their evenings in their gardens, or playing with their children, an additional two hours of daylight would be welcome.

Scientists, men of business, employers of labour, doctors, and astronomers of the highest rank have already expressed their approval. Sir Robert Ball, the Professor of Astronomy and Geometry, from his Observatory at Cambridge, says in reference to this proposal: "Which is the better for our waking hours, glorious sunshine, which costs us nothing, or expensive and incomparably less efficient artificial light?" Only perverted habits could make us hesitate as to the answer to this question. The admirable "scheme of Mr. Willett will rescue 210 hours of our waking life from the gloom of man's puny efforts at illumination, and substitute for it—sunbeams. There are no difficulties connected with the scheme which could weigh for a moment against the advantages of its adoption."

Simple as Mr. Willett's plan is, he must anticipate many years of opposition, and it may be interesting to show how former attempts to reform the calendar, to which we are now all accustomed, were met.

As early as 44 B.C., the inaccurate computations of the year were so great that Julius Cæsar, "the foremost man in all the world," instructed Sosigenes, the astronomer, to re-arrange the calendar and regulate the Civil year entirely by the sun. Without attempting to describe the details of his plan, it is enough to say that the Julian Calendar, so called after its originator, lasted without alteration till 1582, when the Equinox had retrograded from its proper position.

To correct this, Pope Gregory XIII. issued an edict at that time, that in future every year divisible by four should contain 366 days, and be called Leap Year, whereas all other years consisted of only 365 days; and the error, which under the Julian code had accumulated to the extent of ten days, was disposed of by enacting that the fifth day of October should be reckoned the 15th of the same month, and every year was, for the future, to commence on the 1st January. This was the introduction of what still goes by the name of the New Style (N.S.), which is now, I believe, adopted by all Christian countries except Greece and Russia. When it was first promulgated, England, from a truly Protestant jealousy and distrust of everything emanating from the Pope, refused for a time to adopt it; but when, after much opposition, it was adopted, it lasted until the year 1721, when it was found that the Gregorian system was imperfect, for no note in the calculation had been taken of odd hours, and those hours had grown to weeks, and weeks to months, by the middle of the 18th century.

In 1752 Philip Dormer Stanhope, fourth Earl of Chesterfield, had retired from the cares of political strife, and, like a wise man, sought for some occupation. To be cut off from all share in the active progress of the world was to him intolerable, and he hit upon a task not only of interest to himself, but of incalculable benefit to the public. With Lord Macclesfield, the astronomer, one of the greatest mathematicians in Europe, he set to work to again reform the calendar. England, at heart a conservative country, with true conservative instincts, was opposed to any change, even though an improvement; but Lord Chesterfield applied himself to this unpopular task. He broached his intention to the Duke of Newcastle, who besought him to abandon his idea, as being a new-fangled plan, which he abhorred. "It was not," Lord Chesterfield wrote to his son, "very honourable for England to remain in a gross and avowed error, the inconvenience of which was likewise felt by all those who had foreign correspondence, whether political or mercantile. I determined, therefore, to attempt the reformation, and consulted the best lawyers and the most skilful astronomers, and we cooked up a Bill for that purpose."

The Bill was accordingly prepared, and introduced into the House of Lords on the 25th February, 1751. Chesterfield, with a certain cynicism, tells his son: "It was absolutely necessary to make the House of Lords think that I knew something of the matter, and also to make them believe that they knew something of it themselves, which they do not. For my own part, I could just as soon have talked Celtic or Sclavonian to them as astronomy, and they would have understood them just as well; so I resolved to do better than speak to the purpose, and to please

"instead of informing them. I gave them, therefore, only an historical account of calendars, from the Egyptian down to the Gregorian, amusing them now and then with little episodes; but I was particularly attentive to the choice of my words, to the roundness and harmony of my periods, to my elocution and to my action. This succeeded, and ever will succeed. They thought I was informed because I pleased them, and many of them said that I had made the whole matter very clear to them—whereas, God knows, I had not attempted it. Lord Macclesfield, who had the greatest share in forming the Bill, and is one of the greatest mathematicians in Europe, spoke afterwards with infinite knowledge and all the clearness which so intricate a matter would admit of; but as his words, his periods, and his utterance were not near so good as mine, the preference was most unanimously, but most unjustly, given to me. His speech was worth a thousand of mine."

The Bill was sent by the House of Lords to the House of Commons, and after sundry amendments was read a third time on 17th May, and received the Royal assent on 22nd May, 1751. The new Act ordained that the year should begin on January 1st, and that the eleven intermediate days, between 2nd and 14th September, 1752, should be suppressed, so that the day succeeding the 2nd should be reckoned the 14th of that month.

"Give us back the eleven days we have been robbed of," was the cry of the populace. The death of the Astronomer Royal, who died so painfully in 1762, was attributed to the share he had taken in this "robbery." Lord Macclesfield fared even worse, and the sins of the father were visited on his son; for when he stood for Parliament in Oxfordshire he was taunted with this "robbery," and one of the ballads of the election commenced:

"In seventeen hundred and seventy-three
"The style it was changed to Popery."

Simple and beneficial to all classes as this proposal of Mr. Willett's appears to be, we may be sure it will be met with opposition from the thoughtless conventionalists of all shades; from the luxury-loving and selfish people who only consider what will affect them individually. The *Vis inertia* will help to withstand any change, however good it is in itself, because it is a change; and are we sure that there do not exist people as uneducated and foolish as they were in Lord Chesterfield's time, who loaded him with abuse for the alteration he effected?

The only change in the calendar since that date was Romme's new calendar in the Republican year of 1793, which was speedily adopted by a French municipality, but only lasted till 1808, when Napoleon

abolished it; but Romme, one of the *Ultimi Romanorum*, as Carlyle calls him, drew a knife and stabbed himself, in order to save himself from a worse fate. We hope that such an end will not await Mr. Willett, and that he may live to see many bright hours wrested from the Prince of Darkness, and follow Thomas Moore's advice, though not exactly in the sense he intended, when he wrote—

"That the best of all ways
"To lengthen our days,
"Is to steal a few hours from the night."

ALGERNON WEST.

CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA.

IS Christianity destined to become the religion of India? If we look at the latest census tables in the light of the history of India, the question seems almost ridiculous. For there has been a Christian community in South India since the third century at latest; since the sixteenth century there has been a vigorous Roman Catholic propaganda; and for the last two centuries there have been Protestant Missions. Yet even to-day all the Christians of India taken together are only *one per cent.* of the population, surely a most pitiable result of seventeen centuries of Syrian Christianity, four centuries of Roman Catholicism, and two centuries of Protestantism.

1. Is it possible to get at the reason why the advance has been so exceedingly slow? It would be at least interesting to know what the great obstacle is.

The Aryan tribes, which entered India from the north-west, and gradually conquered the whole of the northern half of the peninsula, were greatly under the domination of that universal master of the ancient world, custom. They held it to be axiomatic that a man was bound to do what his ancestors did. Their contact with the tribes which were in India before them tended greatly to strengthen the hold of this principle. For they were profoundly conscious of their great superiority over these people both in faith and manners. Their knowledge of the gods of light was their most precious possession, and distinguished them even more than their fair complexion from these dark-skinned devil-worshippers, while they could feel only disgust for their coarse habits and unclean food. Thus, while there is abundant evidence to prove that a very large proportion of the immigrants intermarried with the aboriginal tribes, the more cultured families came to feel more keenly than ever the need of the preservation of race purity by segregation. *Adherence to ancestral custom* thus came to be more highly regarded than ever, and was definitely used as a protection against the introduction of the manners of the barbarians.

As the Aryan race advanced in culture and developed class distinctions, the increasing emphasis laid on ancestral custom necessarily had the effect of stiffening the lines marking off the classes one from another; and so classes, which were originally occupation groups, insensibly hardened into castes. This process was doubtless helped by the Aryanising of the aboriginal tribes of the North. As soon as they submitted to Brahmanical teaching and rules, they were received within the pale; but they were kept quite distinct from the Aryans. The reception of these tribes within the camp, coupled with their segregation from complete fellowship, would make the setting up of rigid partitions among the Aryans themselves seem more natural.

It was doubtless the actual existence of caste that produced the belief that the differences between the various races and classes of men are eternal, divinely instituted, and to be carefully respected; but once the belief had appeared, it provided a religious sanction for the system, and so contributed greatly to its final establishment and especially to its perpetuation. In any case, caste gradually took shape in the Aryan community, increasing in rigidity as time went on; and, in order that caste might be kept pure, the old principle of adherence to ancestral custom was applied with far greater strictness than ever. Each caste was surrounded by a protective hedge of ancient customs, so as to prevent defilement from other castes or from races outside the system. Thus *the resistance of outside influences by means of strict adherence to ancestral custom* became quite early one of the chief characteristics of Indo-Aryan society; and all through the centuries Hindus have instinctively acted on this principle.

Another idea emerged at a slightly later date, but obtained quite as great an ascendancy over the Hindu mind. This was the belief in Metempsychosis, that souls are emanations of the divine spirit, sparks from the central fire, drops from the ocean of divinity, that each soul is incarnated in a body times without number, that the same soul may be in one life a god, in another a man, in a third an animal or even a plant, and that there can be no rest for the soul nor relief from suffering until it finds release from the necessity of birth and returns to the divine source whence it came. This theory standing by itself is really inconsistent with the doctrine of caste, since it condemns the Brahman, the Sudra, and the unclean Mleccha to a common welter of sorrow, and confounds man with the animals, nay, even with the plants. But Metempsychosis is incomprehensible without its complement, the theory of *Karma*; and this doctrine, that the merit and demerit of one life infallibly fix the character of the next, at once gives a man's position in the world an ethical significance, displays the various distinctions and differences among men as the unavoidable outworkings of a law of righteousness, and thus completely justifies the caste system.

Another important consequence of the theory ought to be noted. Since it must be a man's aim to get release as soon as possible from the necessity of re-birth, in order to escape from the entanglement of the phenomenal world to the changeless depths of the divinity, whence he originally emerged; and since all created things are destined to be swallowed up in the same first cause, leaving no result or even record of their long wandering behind them, the sojourn of man in the universe is reduced to a resultless and meaningless process. So the one word which sums up the whole phenomenal order to the Hindu is *Maya*, a word which combines two strands of meaning, equally significant here, illusion and play. The world is illusive through and through, and the drama of human life is comparable to the irresponsible play of the fancy, beautiful, fascinating, but void of meaning. Hence it was that the ancient Hindus wrote no history: they would as soon have thought of chronicling the play of the clouds, of sunset. This conception of human life necessarily made it impossible for the Hindu to form the idea of progress: who would think of improving a system which is essentially a series of kaleidoscopic transformations without value or meaning! As well look for progress in the dance of the gnats in the evening air, or in the wash of pebbles in the bed of a stream. Hence, politics and government were never taken seriously by the best men, and freedom was never dreamt of; for such an idea could have no value for a genuinely Hindu mind. The more rational a Hindu was, the less interest he took in the State, and the more gladly he left the government to be seized by the man who cared more for power than reason. From this point of view the sad story of the political history of India becomes more intelligible. Even religion, morality and philosophy existed only that they might efface themselves, only to teach man to get rid of them. Thus, those men had no conceptions which would suggest to their minds the possibility of the betterment of their social and religious system. A mode of life remaining changeless through all generations would seem to them both possible and desirable. Wisdom had come to their fathers by revelation or discovery: it was the duty of their sons not to depart from it.

Thus Metempsychosis, with its two pendant doctrines, *Karma* and *Maya*, not only buttressed the caste system, but provided a metaphysical background, an intelligible justification, for that changeless mode of life which was already the Hindu ideal.

In this way the whole Hindu race learned how to save itself as a religious and social community from alien contamination, amid the polluting influences of savage and semi-savage tribes, and the never-ceasing political changes of ancient India. The method was the rigid adherence to every detail of traditional law and custom, and the uncompromising rejection of every new thing, whether good or bad. Naturally, this protective armour, forged, as it was, from the triple

steel of ancestral usage, caste and metempsychosis, became, in the course of the centuries, a defence of almost illimitable strength.

The self-protective power thus developed has won almost incredible victories. That Buddhism, with its great moral advantages, after climbing to such splendid pre-eminence in the days of the Mauryas and later monarchs, should have been completely overthrown, and indeed, crowded out of India, is a stupendous testimony to the staying power of the old faith. The fall of Jainism in the West and the South is a similar, if a smaller, instance. Nor ought we to forget that Hellas, so prolific in influence elsewhere, proved almost barren in India. Another great example is Mohammedanism. Early in the eighth century Mohammedan preaching began in India, and it has gone on increasing in volume until the present day, among aborigines as well as among Hindus. The sword came in with the Koran, and for centuries was widely used as a persuasive. For five full centuries Mohammedan powers were supreme in India; and at the court of every prince, except Akbar, and the office of every subordinate submission to the prophet brought large advantages. That the whole number of Mohammedans in India to-day, including those of foreign descent, is little more than one-fifth of the population is final proof that the old faith has great powers of resistance. Minor instances need not be mentioned.

2. This, then, is the main reason why Christianity, though it has been in India so long, has won but a very small percentage of the inhabitants. Hinduism became what it is in a struggle to maintain itself against alien systems, and in the struggle developed a defensive armour which is without a parallel in the history of religion. Thus, one of the most significant questions which can be asked to-day is this: Will this defensive armour last? It may be worth while turning to the present condition of India to see whether there is any evidence available that might enable us to answer the question. Are there any movements among the people that point to a strengthening or a weakening of the conservative elements of Hinduism?

The largest fact in recent Indian history is the intellectual and moral upheaval which has produced the modern educated Hindu. The influences of this revolutionary change have as yet scarcely touched the common people; but the educated classes are so numerous and wield so much power everywhere that the movement is of very large significance indeed. The following seem to be its most noteworthy features:—

Desire for Reform.—Educated Hindus have come to see the pit of weakness, suffering and degradation into which India has fallen, and their greatest passion is to retrieve this unspeakable disaster and to set her in an honoured place among the nations. The old policy of cast-iron conservatism is frankly acknowledged to be the

greatest of all mistakes. India, they see, must seek progress by means of reform in every part of her life.

Educational Enthusiasm.—These men recognise that English education has been the means of opening their own minds and enabling them to appreciate the present condition of their country and the means required for restoration; and therefore their first desire is the extension of English education, so that every boy throughout the country may have a chance of showing whether he is fit to go to High School and then to College. Until recently they laid most stress on that which brought enlightenment first of all, the ordinary subjects of an Arts' education; but they now perceive that the poverty of India can never be lightened until the material resources of the land are utilised and numerous industries set on foot throughout the country. Consequently many students are being sent to Britain, Germany, America and Japan, that they may receive a trustworthy scientific and industrial education.

Passion for Freedom.—English history has brought them face to face with the long glorious struggle for liberty in Britain and with the priceless results of the struggle, while in the capacity and character of the rulers of India they have an object lesson to which they cannot be blind. It was inevitable, therefore, that a passionate desire to set the same precious plant in the soil of India should arise. Hence the National Congress, with all its doings, wise and otherwise. How great this passion is, the present unrest in India proves. The whole movement has become so intensely national as to cause great embitterment of feeling towards Europeans, and to rouse hatred against Christianity merely as a foreign religion.

Demand for Equality.—The modern Hindu regards himself as the equal of his English rulers. The political crusade of the National Congress is absurd, unless the postulate of the natural equality of men be granted. This is behind all the proposals of the popular party, *e.g.*, that examinations for the Indian Civil Service should be held simultaneously in India and in England, and that a greater share in the Government of India should be granted to Indians. From the same source springs the very justifiable indignation of the native press, when a European assaults an Indian. Indeed, it is this conviction of the simple human dignity of every man that gives the new national consciousness its strength and nobility. It takes no account of race, religion, caste or class, but embraces the whole population of the peninsula in the sweep of its sympathy; while all are summoned to unite in common labour to bring in the new glorious India that is to be.

A New Attitude to Women.—The old double standard of chastity, strict for women, lax for men, is steadily changing; concubinage has vanished utterly; the Nautch is passing out of educated society; the

gross polygamy so long practised by Kulin Brahmans in Bengal is being rapidly killed by public opinion; and the second wife, married in accordance with Hindu law when the first proves childless, is now felt to require apology. Vidyasagar, the great Calcutta scholar, through whose efforts the re-marriage of Hindu widows was legalised, received during his lifetime only bitter invective and social ostracism as the reward of his chivalry; but nowadays his anniversary is celebrated with great enthusiasm every year in the city that persecuted him*; the wrongs of the widow are constantly discussed in the native press; men are beginning to realise how irrational and unhumanly it is to allow re-marriage in the case of men and to forbid it in the case of women; and the gradual change of public opinion is reflected in the increasing number of cases of widow re-marriage even among the highest castes.† The conviction, which has been frequently expressed by the more advanced social reformers, that one of the chief causes of the weakness of modern India is the ignorance and seclusion of her women, is steadily forcing itself upon the mind and conscience of the average man. The advance of female education is now eagerly desired by a growing and powerful minority, but the prejudices of the Zenana and the custom of child-marriage seriously retard progress. That child-marriage is a great evil and, above all things, an unspeakable wrong to the twelve-year-old wife (often younger), is a belief which cannot yet be said to be held by all educated Hindus, but it has laid hold of groups of the wisest and best men with an iron grip, and among the majority the prejudices of ages are slowly yielding to reason and compassion.

New Humanitarian Feeling.—The Government of India, while most stringently neutral in matters of religion, have during the last seventy years felt driven by the demands of morality to prohibit certain inhuman usages which were ordained or at least condoned by Hinduism, e.g., *Sati* (the burning of widows), *Thugi* (the murder and robbery of travellers), Infanticide, Human Sacrifice, Torture in Worship, and Obscenity. There is not an enlightened Hindu to-day who would wish to reverse the action of Government on any one of these points. Nay, rather, the modern Hindu has reached the position that every religious usage must submit to the scrutiny of morality and compassion. Hence the licence and obscenity of the Holi festival and the abominations of the left-hand Saktas are now almost universally condemned.‡ But feeling goes much farther: there is deep sympathy with all the sufferings of the poor of India, and with distress anywhere outside India. Help was sent during the war for the Jap

* During the writing of this paper a statue has been erected in his honour in College Square, Calcutta.

† As these pages pass through the press, all Calcutta is interested in the marriage of a widowed daughter of an orthodox Brahman, a judge of the High Court.

‡ Yet Temple prostitution goes on unchecked in South India, and child widows are most cruelly treated all over the country, even in the houses of educated men, and all in the name of religion.

wounded; money is frequently subscribed for the famine-stricken of India; and numbers of societies for the alleviation of distress may be found in the large cities.

It is no dilettante movement we are dealing with, but an intellectual and moral upheaval of volcanic energy. These new ideas and forms of feeling are precisely the things which the modern Hindu cares most for. His papers, daily, weekly, and monthly, his novels, poems and speeches, deal with little else. It is round these that his life revolves. We shall be reminded that the vast majority of these men have had a very meagre education. That is perfectly true; yet in the matters we are dealing with their education is by no means neglected. At school and college they pick up enough English and history to enable them to follow the press and to enjoy the declamations of the platform; and then they learn with avidity all that their journalists, lecturers and political leaders teach with so much perseverance. Further, if the emphasis we are accustomed to lay on moral as distinct from intellectual training be justified, then this second curriculum must be of large value indeed. The sufferings and the needs of India, the possibility and the duty of progress, human equality with all its ennobling and stimulating implications, the good of the people as the sole end of government, the call of patriotism and of public duty, the necessity of courage and of self-help, and the beauty of philanthropy—these are all preached with vehement earnestness and contagious zeal.

There can be no doubt as to the significance of this movement. The minds of the educated classes have been forced open: *the protective armour of Hinduism has been pierced*. Educated Hindus now welcome with eagerness and prize as their most cherished possession a mass of foreign ideas and ideals. Further, these new ideas are in hopeless contradiction with the old. Their fathers lived with their eyes fixed on the past in inexpressible reverence: they have their hope in the future. Towards the new, free, happy India that is to be every eye now strains. The aim and inspiration of the whole movement is progress—progress educational, moral, social, religious, industrial, political. The modern spirit has thus seized the very citadel of the Hindu mind, and has filled it with a garrison of its own. For to Hinduism Progress is unthinkable, and Change is the essence of all heresies. All the other watchwords of the movement are in like case. Equality, which is the dynamic of the whole political campaign, is diametrically opposed to the usages of caste and to the theory of the divine origin of class and race distinctions. The dignity of the true statesman's work and the value of all faithful toil done for the State are now commonplaces on the Congress platform: how can they be reconciled with the Hindu conception of human life and the Hindu ideal of the wise man? The moral feeling

which acts so powerfully in every educated Hindu's life, pleading for the widow, the child, the outcast, the foreigner, is a noble, a priceless thing; but how is it that Hindus do not see that it cuts clean athwart the old rule of conformity to custom? Their forefathers were logical; for they allowed that rule to cover *Thugi*, *Sati*, infanticide, human sacrifice, temple prostitution, unspeakable licence and inexpressible cruelty. Their sons do not see that either the new morality or the old rule must go.

We need scarcely stay to point out the powerful Christian influence active in this movement. Progress, freedom, the dignity of man, the equality of all men before God, the sacredness of woman, the passion for helping all in distress—there can be no question whence these burning ideas come.

Thus, it is absolutely clear that under the pressure of the modern movement the old safeguards of Hinduism have gone down. Nor can there be any doubt that the movement is destined to spread. The development of India is altogether impossible without a far wider extension of education; and with education will come those influences which break the old armour up. Mediævalism is doomed to disappear before the face of the modern spirit. We are therefore on perfectly sure ground when we affirm that the defensive armour of Hinduism is doomed and will assuredly pass away.

3. If, then, the modern movement has proved so pervasive intellectually and morally, *what are the results produced in religion?*

Attention has frequently been drawn to the wide revolt against Hinduism which carried so many of the most advanced men into scepticism and various excesses during the first half-century of the illumination. A number of the more reverent spirits became Christians; another group joined the Brahmo Somaj; but of the rest a very large proportion tended to agnosticism. Since then, however, a very different and far more powerful movement, seeking reconstruction and revival, has appeared, and has carried along with it the great majority of educated men. The new movement is characterised above all things by faith, by deep appreciation of the place of religion in the life of a people and by a passionate desire to restore Hinduism to its old place of supremacy.

The first signs of the change appeared in a new type of literature which sprang up, defending Hinduism from Christian criticism and showing Hindus what a great and glorious heritage they had in their sacred literature. Later there arose a whole army of lecturers, monks and teachers, who went from town to town, delivering apologetic lectures, expounding the sacred books, holding classes for their study, and preaching in the streets to enthusiastic crowds. These defenders of the faith were very far from unanimity: one party put forward the Vedas as the real basis of Hinduism; a second summoned their countrymen to form their lives on the religious philosophy of the

Upanishads; a third declared that the Vedanta as taught by Sankaracharjya was the only impregnable rock of the holy faith; a fourth thought the *Bhagavadgita* formed a better rallying ground, because eclectically embracing the Sankhya and the Yoga as well as the Vedanta; while others thrust Krishna into the foreground as the centre of a monotheistic religion with an incarnation story in it.

Recently, however, most of these system-sketchers have allowed themselves to be included in one great organisation, formed for the defence of Hinduism. A large proportion of the educated men have flung themselves into this movement with enthusiasm, and the rest have allowed themselves to be led. There are still divergences of opinion, but for the present they are hushed amid the new fervour of practical work in defence of the ancient faith. Everywhere one hears of the Revival of Hinduism, of the Bharat Dharma Mahamandal and of Mrs. Besant's leadership.

Several groups continue to go their own way, refusing to be swept along by the flood which bears the multitude. The chief among these are the theistic movements, the Dev Somaj, the Arya Somaj, the Prarthana Somaj, and the various sections of the Brahmo Somaj. Yet all the organisations have a great deal in common. To be thoroughly Hindu, and at the same time to introduce just as much reform as is necessary to make the religion practically efficient in these modern days, and so to prove that Christianity is unnecessary—this is the ideal. The puzzle is to know how much reform is necessary, how much of the beloved traditional religion must be sacrificed to the wolves. The various sections that make up the central mass and all these minor groups might be arranged in an ascending (or descending) series according to the amount of deflection each shows from the full standard of the ancient faith.

Apart from its extraordinary strength and success, perhaps the most remarkable feature of this whole religious upheaval is its relation to Christianity. I believe this relation will be found to be double.

Its first and most prominent aspect is *opposition*. In the case of the Hindu Revival and the Arya Somaj, this opposition usually takes the form of vehement hostility. Christianity is the one object of hatred and condemnation. Throughout their literature Missionaries, Christians, Christian thought and Christian practice are attacked with a bitterness which is at first sight somewhat hard to understand; and frequently this literary criticism has been translated into disturbances in the streets and squares of Indian cities. Even those whose opposition is accompanied by something of friendliness and commendation make it one of their chief duties to show how utterly unnecessary it is to introduce Christianity into India. Nor is it wonderful that men should think along these lines: indeed, it would be strange if they did not. What is remarkable is this, that in India to-day, where all the faiths of the world are clashing, every religious

movement singles Christianity out as its sole formidable antagonist. What is the reason why each assumes the fighting attitude towards Christianity?

Curiously enough, this determined opposition is in every case accompanied by what the writer believes may quite fairly be termed *simulation* on a large scale. This is visible in many ways. Here we may be content with two or three aspects of the tendency. Throughout the literature of the movement, and, indeed, all the journalism and literature of the modern Hindu, one finds a great deal of Christianity both in thought and language. The most recent will probably be the best example. We append in a note the prayer with which the last Indian National Congress was opened in Calcutta.* In the case of the Theistic movements, especially among the Brahmos, the debt owing to Christianity is very great, in theology and ethics, in Church organisation and worship. In the case of literature condemned as immoral by the missionary the great resource is allegory, this method having the magic power of changing what is most objectionable into the loftiest moral and spiritual truth. It is highly instructive to watch the Hindu alchemist transmute some unlovely Puranic myth into the finest Christian teaching. So polytheism, idolatry, caste and superstition, which have always had

* "O most Gracious God and Father, by whose Divine Providence mankind is ruled and all things are made to work out His good ends, we thank Thee for enabling us, Thy unworthy servants, to assemble once more in this great city for this the twenty-second session of our National Congress. We bless Thy Holy Name that Thou didst put into the hearts of our leaders, some of whom have now departed this life, to establish this Congress, and didst grant them wisdom and ability to maintain and develop it in the face of manifold and vast difficulties. We heartily thank Thee for the measure of usefulness granted to our Congress in the past, in drawing together in the bonds of friendship, fellowship and united effort our countrymen separated as they are by difference of race, creed, language, and social customs. We also render Thee most humble and hearty thanks for the marvellous growth of the true spirit of Nationalism which has recently manifested itself in all parts of our beloved motherland.

"We seek Thy blessing, O Heavenly Father, on the proceedings of the present session of our Congress. Give to the President and to all speakers the guidance of Thy Holy Spirit, so that nothing may be said or done here that is not in accordance with Thy Holy Will. Remove from us all ill-feeling, prejudice, and uncharitableness, and fill our hearts with a genuine desire for the good of the country and its people, with unswerving loyalty to our rulers, and with good feelings towards all sections of the inhabitants of this land. Let moderation and earnestness, wisdom and charity, humility and harmony characterize our proceedings at this great gathering.

"We implore Thy blessing on our Gracious Sovereign and Emperor, King Edward, and on the Royal Family. Enable those that bear rule in this land under His Imperial Majesty to realise their unique responsibilities consequent on their position which Thou hast been pleased to grant them, and help them to fulfil the sacred charge committed to them, so as to glorify Thy Name, and to benefit our people. More especially at this time we beseech Thee, O Lord, to inspire all the members of the ruling race with true sympathy for the people over whom Thou hast placed them as rulers.

"O merciful God, we seek Thy guidance and help in checking and uprooting all the evils which hinder our progress and improvement as a people. Enable us to make ourselves worthy in every respect for the privileges of self-government and participation in the administration of the country which we seek and claim. Pardon our many shortcomings, strengthen our infirmities, bless our labours, and bestow on us such a measure of success as Thou thinkest fit. Grant us the spirit of self-effacement and self-sacrifice, and accept our humble services to the glory of Thy Holy Name, and the good of our beloved motherland.—AMEN."

to endure a great deal of missionary criticism, are defended by elaborate arguments drawn from modern psychology, ethics, and science, the latest discoveries being unblushingly used to justify the moral value of bathing in the Ganges, the power of muttered charms, the hygienic value of sacrifice, or the reality of caste distinctions. Then the Hindu revival copies Missionary methods all round. The Central Hindu College, Benares, is a Hindu facsimile of a Christian college; and schools, boarding schools and college hostels with all their distinctive Christian features have been transplanted and Hinduised. Even zenana visitation has been attempted in the interests of the Revival. The Bible Society has long presented copies of the Scriptures to those who pass University examinations in India, and certain Missions have held public Scripture examinations for prizes: both plans have been copied by our Neo-Hindu friends. But not only are forms of work taken over; the very phraseology is retained. Thus the whole movement is a *Revival*; it has Missions and Missionaries, Young Men's Hindu Associations, Prayer Meetings, Tracts and even Catechisms!

What, then, is the significance of this vast and powerful religious agitation with its many forms and its contagious enthusiasm? The whole movement is a frank acknowledgment of what we have already shown to be true, that the protective armour of Hinduism has been pierced; for the sole end and aim of the movement is to organise Hindus in defence of their faith. Educated Indians recognise that, in admitting Western teaching and conceptions into their minds, they have given up the ancient Indian policy of the exclusion of all alien ideas; and they glory in the intellectual freedom and growth which they have thereby attained; but, still dominated by those conservative instincts which antagonise every religious innovation, fired with hatred of Christianity because it seeks to destroy the Hindu social system, and scared by its rapid growth and omnipresent influence, they have rallied in their thousands in defence of the ancient faith. Could anyone wish for clearer proof of the serious character of the breach which has been made in Hinduism?

The leader and organiser of the central organisation is not a Brahman, is not even a Hindu, but is a foreigner and a woman. How incredible! the religion of caste led by a foreigner! a woman the champion of Brahmanism! But this fact is not merely curious: it is pregnant with meaning. It is a visible embodiment of the truth that the enemy are in the citadel, that these powerful combinations themselves have accepted and are spreading ideas and practices which are altogether alien to Hinduism.

The present position of affairs is sufficiently suggestive. Yet we cannot forget that we have not yet reached the end. The modern movement is yet young in India; the Hindu revival is not thirty years old. What will happen when modern education touches the

great middle class of India with their practical ideals and business training? What will happen to the Hindu Revival, when serious men have had time to realise its puerilities and superstitions? What will happen, when men begin to see how hopelessly their old Hindu notions contradict the liberal intellectual and moral conceptions which they delight in?

The student cannot fail to be struck with the close parallel between these movements and the great revival which the Pagan faiths of the Roman Empire experienced in the early centuries of our era, when the Christian attack was at its height. Almost every word of the vivid picture of the religion of Julian drawn by Gibbon in the first half of his twenty-third chapter is applicable to the modern Hindu.

4. We shall keep within quite safe limits if we affirm that not within the last two thousand years at least has the Hindu intellect undergone such a revolutionary change as these last seventy-five years have brought. Amid all the fierce religious struggles and devastating invasions of those long centuries the Hindu mind preserved its ancient thought and principles untouched, and never turned aside from its own interests and pursuits. But that can be said no longer. The hackneyed lines,

"She let the legions thunder past,
"And plunged in thought again,"

are not true of modern India. Her leading sons to-day are not plunged in meditation but in politics, journalism, teaching, medicine, litigation and the Indian Civil Service.

What has made the difference? How is it that the Hindu mind which succeeded in resisting outside influences so long, began to change so radically some seventy or eighty years ago? Clearly some very powerful force, or group of forces, began to operate early in the nineteenth century; for the new movement did not appear until after 1830. Can we discover what these forces were?

(a) Every one acknowledges that the most potent of all causes in opening the Hindu mind has been English education, whether given in Missionary, Government or native institutions. It has not only given these men modern science and historical conceptions and brought home to them the value of liberty, but has taught them to think in modern ways and laid them open to Western influence in all other directions.

(b) The second place is held by Christian teaching, whether oral or literary. Both the direct presentation of Christian ideas, religious, moral and social, and the less welcome criticism of Hinduism, have been of incalculable service. The reading of the English Bible has been a mighty revolutionary force in itself. While many Europeans are inclined to belittle the influence of Missions,

Indians themselves frankly acknowledge that both the general illumination and the Hindu Revival are largely owing to the teaching of Missionaries.

(c) In the third rank stands Christian philanthropy, first the action of Government in putting down objectionable Hindu practices, succouring the famine-stricken, building hospitals, etc., and secondly the practical work of the Missionary societies, more especially vernacular education, female education, both in school and zenana, medical missions, orphanages, leper asylums and famine relief. On this point also Indian opinion gives no uncertain verdict.

(d) Lastly, the action of Government, which has, at least in the main, endeavoured to govern for the good of the people, and has sought to treat all races, religions and castes as equal, and as entitled to the strictest justice. This has proved an object lesson to the modern Hindu of very great potency, stimulating and modifying his thought in many directions.

Thus it would seem to be true that the remarkable intellectual, social and religious upheaval which we have been considering has been produced by the combined action of Christian Missions and the Government of India.

We get much nearer the efficient cause of the great change, when we notice that all the forms of Christian activity which have proved most effective have been introduced by the Protestant Churches, and have been used by them almost exclusively. Roman Catholic work has its own value, but it has not been a perceptible factor in the production of the revolution.*

It will now be clear why the modern movement with all that followed it began when it did. It was in the early decades of the nineteenth century that the spirit and policy now traditional in the Government of India took form. The idea that Britain is responsible for the welfare of India was then first distinctly recognised, and found expression in the inception of the series of moral reforms outlined above, in the steady introduction of better methods of government and in the Resolution (largely inspired by Duff) which committed the Government to English education, and secured the dominance of the thought and science of the West in India. These changes were in great measure brought about by the agitation of the Evangelical party in England. The same period saw the flowering of Protestant Missionary effort in its most fruitful forms. English education, medical work, zenana work, leper asylums and systematic famine-relief were all introduced between 1830 and 1870; while vernacular

* Roman Catholic Missionaries never preach to Hindus in the streets or squares, at fairs or in preaching chapels. They have not given the people the Bible. In their colleges for Hindus they give no Christian instruction. The share they have taken in female education among Hindus must be infinitesimal. Their voice is never raised against caste; indeed it is rampant in their Churches. They cannot condemn idolatry; for they use images themselves. Nor have they helped the Protestant Missionary in his long battle with the abominations of the Hindu social system.

preaching, vernacular education, female education, the dissemination of the Bible, and literary work were so elaborated and transformed during that period as to become practically new methods.

These modern overturnings, which have so completely altered the attitude of thinking Hindus towards Western things, will of necessity be of great service to Christianity, no matter what may have produced them. Yet it is interesting to realise how great the vitality and force resident in Protestantism must be, since it has had such a large share in producing the revolution.

5. Seeing that the modern movement has so greatly altered the outlook for Christianity in India, we shall now scan the census results with more intelligent interest. In the first volume of the Report attention is directed to the swift progress the Church is making. During the decade 1891 to 1901, native Christians increased from 2,036,590 to 2,664,313, an increase of 30.8 per cent, while the whole population increased only 2.5 per cent. Nor is this all; this rapid growth has been going on for thirty years at least. If we take the thirty years as one period, the increase is 113.8 per cent, which is certainly startling.

Let us see, however, where the growth was. If we set the Roman and the Syrian communities in one column and the Protestant in another, we get the following results:—

—	ROMAN AND SYRIAN CHRISTIANS.	PROTESTANTS.
1891	1,444,235	592,355
1901	1,693,828	970,421
Percentage of increase in ten years.	17.2	63.8

Thus Protestants increased during the decade at nearly four times the rate at which Roman and Syrian Christians increased. Clearly, unless this was merely a temporary success, there is a very mighty power working through Protestant Missions. Unfortunately the census tables do not allow us to carry the comparison farther back. But let us consult the tables published by the Roman Catholic and Protestant authorities. We take the following figures from the *Madras Catholic Directory*, and the *Statistics of Protestant Missions* drawn up by the Calcutta Missionary Conference.

Let us take the twenty years from 1851 to 1871:—

—	ROMAN CATHOLICS.	PROTESTANTS.
1851	732,887*	91,092†
1871	934,400*	224,258†
Percentage of increase in 20 years.	27.4	146.1

And the forty years from 1851 to 1891:—

—	ROMAN CATHOLICS.	PROTESTANTS.
1851	732,887*	91,092†
1891	1,313,653*	559,661†
Percentage of increase in 40 years.	79.2	514.3

And finally let us take these figures for 1851 and compare them with the figures of the Government Census of 1901:—

—	ROMAN CATHOLICS.	PROTESTANTS.
1851	732,887	91,092
1901	1,550,614‡	871,991§
Percentage of increase in 50 years.	111.5	857.2

* These figures include all Roman Catholics (European, Eurasian, Native) in British India, the Native States and French India, but not Portuguese India. Figures for the native Roman Catholic population alone are not available.

† These figures include all Protestant Native Christians in India, excluding Burmah. We omit Burmah because no figures are available for 1851. The Protestant census was taken in 1890, not in 1891.

‡ Roman Catholics in India, (European, Eurasian and Native)	1,202,169
Syrian (Roman) Christians	322,586
Roman Catholics in French Territory (see the Madras Catholic Directory for 1907, p. 47)	25,859
	1,550,614

§ Native Protestants in India	970,421
Deduct Protestants in Burmah	98,430
	871,991

What an astounding difference! Clearly Protestantism in India is a force of extraordinary vitality. The modern movement and the religious reaction* were both largely the result of the work of Protestants; and, when we compare the growth of their Missions and of Catholic Missions during the last fifty years, the ratio turns out to be almost 8 to 1, Catholics having doubled their numbers during the half-century, Protestants having multiplied ninefold. Is it any wonder that the advance of Protestantism has roused the Hindus to a wild rally in self-defence?

6. The Census Report makes it quite plain that the bulk of the Protestant gains of recent years have been won either from aboriginal tribes which have never been Hinduised, or from the despised and oppressed castes which whether in the north or the south form the uttermost fringe of Hinduism. Further, Missionary reports inform us that great mass movements of these low-caste people towards Christianity still continue. What is the explanation of this phenomenon?

It is the example of certain groups of low-caste people who some twenty-five to forty years ago became Christian, and who have made such remarkable progress as to astonish all who know the facts. Thus, the Pariahs of South India especially, who have been treated by high-caste Hindus as the mire of the streets for centuries, are turning their eyes towards Christ. So long as they remain Hindus, they are treated like dogs or worse. If they become Christians, they are received as men, and get every opportunity to rise socially, economically, morally.

The more thoughtful Hindus have begun to take note of the phenomenon. Some use wild language in the impotence of anger; but others in all seriousness warn the Hindu community that they must act, else these castes will all be lost. *The Social Reformer* has spoken out very plainly more than once. A very frank article appeared in a recent number of *The Mysore Review*; and the following quotation is from a recent article in *The Arya Messenger*, the organ of the Arya Somaj:—

While the people of India increased in 1891-1901 at the rate of 1½ per cent.,* native Christians increased at the rate of over 30 per cent. Just consider for a moment what Christian missionaries are accomplishing in India, though they come here from the remotest part of Europe. They beat even the Arya Samajists, in spite of their preaching the indigenous faith of the country. The reason is that the Arya Samajists have not yet learnt to work among the masses who form the backbone of India. It is high time for us to realise that the future of India lies not in the hands of the higher classes but of the low-caste people, and if we devote the best part of our energy in raising the status of the masses, we can make every Indian household resound with the chanting of Vedas at no distant date. But where are men, where is the sacrifice?

* This is a mistake; the population increased at the rate of about 2½ per cent.

This is all very interesting as showing us that Hindus are very far from thinking Missions a failure, and that they also realise where the great numerical results are won. But the really crucial point to notice is this, that Hinduism cannot help these people. What they need is to be helped out of the pit into which Hinduism has thrust them, and Hinduism can do that only by giving up the caste system.

These Christians are an object lesson to the world. The ultimate difference between the two religions could not be more vividly set forth. Hinduism has done all that was possible to degrade them; Christianity does all that is possible to raise them. Can there be any question as to the ultimate result on the mind of India? The contrast between the cruel tyranny of the one and the uplifting humanity of the other is too plain to be misunderstood *In hoc signo vinces.*

7. It is often asserted with some confidence that the Mission Colleges have ceased to win converts; and the further conclusion, that there are no accessions nowadays from the student class, has been taken for granted. Both ideas are mistaken. It is quite true that in the majority of Mission Colleges very few converts are now won; but that is by no means true of all. It is, however, much more important to observe that many other methods are now being brought to bear on the educated classes. Individual missionaries at many points throughout the country use Bible classes, lectures, Evangelistic meetings, student hostels, literature; and in the Young Men's Christian Association all these methods are employed in combination. Those who are in touch with work all over India know that more educated converts are being won to-day than ever before, though, being won at many points and by many agencies, they make less impression than the groups of students who came out between 1830 and 1870.

The results produced by Protestant effort upon the educated classes of India form one of the most brilliant achievements of modern Missions. When in the future the history of these times is seen in clear perspective, these results will stand out in unchallenged greatness. The winning from the very heart of Hinduism of a group of highly-educated men who have become the leaders of the Church is a result worth in itself all the cost in men, money and effort; but the impregnation of the whole of the educated classes with Christian thought and feeling is a far greater matter, the full issue of which will not yet appear. To continue, increase and deepen this work at the present moment is a most imperative duty; for the educated class is steadily growing in numbers and influence; the percentage of those being trained in other than Missionary institutions is also steadily rising; while the religious and political distractions of these days are in themselves a trumpet-summons to the Church. There is no work in the world better worth doing to-day than the Christianisation of the brain of India.

8. There is one class of people in India, however, which has as yet yielded but a very small percentage of converts to the Christian Church, and that is the solid middle-class folk, both Hindu and Mohammedan. These people are mostly engaged in agriculture or business; they are respectable people; many of them are very poor; yet most are in fairly comfortable circumstances. They are under the full sway of their religions, however; they have not been seriously crushed, like the Pariahs; nor have they come under the influence of the modern movement. Except in so far as they use the railway, the post office, the telegraph office and other conveniences of civilisation, they are still in the Middle Ages. Their girls receive no education; of their boys only some ten to fifteen per cent. can read and write; ignorance and superstition are still almost universal among them. Thus in their case the defensive armour of Hinduism still remains in all its ancient strength. So that the comparative failure of Christianity among them is not to be wondered at. Yet at certain points groups of these men and women have been won for Christ: the problem even as matters stand is not a hopeless one.

But we ask in all seriousness: What is to be the future of these people who form the backbone of India? Are they to be left in the Middle Ages, or are they to be educated? To this there can be but one answer. Certain Hindu leaders may not be very anxious for their enlightenment; but the fixed policy of the Government is to press forward education as rapidly as finance and prejudice will allow; and even if they were lukewarm in their policy, the circumstances of the times would of themselves compel the introduction of modern education. What can India do, when Japan has already universal education, and China and Korea are following in her steps as fast as they possibly can? Nothing can save India from utter economic ruin, if her people do not receive education.

Thus education will necessarily be extended to these people, and with it will come all the influences that have already shaken Hinduism so seriously in the minds of the educated classes. Every advance in knowledge and civilisation works in favour of Christianity. On the other flank, the Christianised Pariahs and aborigines are rising up; and the example of their progress will tell more and more, as the years go by, on the outlying groups and lower castes of the great middle class. Meanwhile Mission methods are being steadily perfected, and Missionaries are learning how to deal with the middle-class man; and another force of altogether immeasurable potency is getting ready to attack this particular side of the problem.

9. The new force we refer to is the Native Protestant Community of India, with regard to which we have three things to say:—

(a). They are now a million strong, and are thus even in numbers an appreciable element in the population.

(b). They are the most progressive community in India. This

may be readily understood from a purely social standpoint. Education is being pressed forward amongst them as rapidly as possible; they have complete social freedom; they represent all the chief races of India. These three causes working together will necessarily lead to such progress as no other religious group on the soil of India will be able to approach. How great their educational progress is becomes manifest only when we realise that an unending procession of illiterates from the depressed classes is constantly pouring into the Church. In spite of that the Christian community as a whole is easily first in female education, and in general literacy is surpassed only by the Buddhists of Burmah and the Jains, both of which are old settled communities, receiving no depressing additions. It is unfortunate that the Census returns do not give us any information about literacy among Protestants as a class; for it is well known that it is vastly higher than among Roman Catholics or Syrians. The only definite fact ascertainable seems to be this, that in students attending High School or College the proportion among the ordinary population is 1 in 10,000, while among Protestants it is 1 in 1,000. The community is growing rapidly in wealth, position and influence. The great advance of recent years is shown by the numbers of Protestants, both men and women, who have won a prominent place in the public life of India. But the clearest proof of all is that which we have already referred to, the way in which the depressed classes, within a single generation, are lifted to a new social grade, and individuals among them rise to positions of responsibility and influence.

(c). They are by far the finest spiritual force in India. They enjoy the immeasurable advantage of the living energy of the Christian faith as opposed to the lukewarmness of mere theism or the unprogressive self-complacency of Hinduism. For Christianity goes forward, while the Brahmo Somaj makes very little headway; not for want of leaders, not for want of ability, not for want of money, but from sheer indifference. On the other hand, Hindus and members of the Arya Somaj are hampered by caste in all they attempt to do for the people of India. While that unsocial system lasts, how can there be brotherhood or progress? The founder of the Arya Somaj denounced caste as neither Aryan nor human: his followers applaud his sentiments, but take care not to practise them. What can such men do to stay the rising tide of Christianity?

The native Protestant community is by no means perfect, but it is alive and is steadily growing in spiritual power. Socially and morally there is continuous progress. Those remnants of caste which have clouded the life of certain churches of the south are being steadily expelled; and the age of marriage is gradually rising, even among the more ignorant. There has been continuous and very large advance in self-support and self-government within recent years, and the movement is still going forward. The national spirit

is among them, and they have set themselves to work out the unification of the churches. The various Presbyterian denominations have become one; negotiations for the inclusion of Congregationalists are in progress; other bodies are drawing together; and the ideal of the One Church of India has laid hold of all hearts.

At a great many points during the last three years there have been powerful revivals, which in every case have purified the moral and religious life of the community, and in a few centres have led to the conversion of large numbers of outsiders. This work is still going forward.

But the surest of all tokens of the advance of spiritual life in the Christian Church is the rise of Missionary zeal. The last quarter of a century has seen the emergence of a number of Indian Protestants, both men and women, who have started Mission work independently and have carried it on to great success. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these efforts are Pundita Ramabai's Homes at Poona, the Rev. Mathura Nath Bose's Mission at Gopalgunge, Bengal, and the work of Ko San Ye in Burmah; but there are many others. Preaching Bands, Evangelistic Brotherhoods and Missionary Societies have sprung up at many points, the most prominent being the Jaffna Missionary Society and the Tinnevelley Missionary Society. But all these efforts have been eclipsed by a new enterprise, the formation of the National Missionary Society of India. This is a purely Indian and interdenominational organisation. It was formed at Serampore on Christmas Day, 1905, by a gathering of young men representative of the Protestant Churches of all parts of India and Ceylon. Work has been started in the Montgomery District of the Punjab.

These young Indians, sons of the soil and faithful soldiers of the Cross, will prove valuable allies in the campaign for the winning of the middle-class folk. The freedom and independence of the new Society will bring out self-reliance, will encourage originality and will give the Indian genius opportunity to grow along national lines. Inured to the climate and to Indian modes of travel, knowing the people, their languages, customs, prejudices and ideals as no foreigner ever can, and filled with instinctive racial sympathy as well as with the love of Christ, these men can scarcely fail to prove more effective than European Missionaries. Nor will the new Society gain all the glory. In all the Missions greater freedom is being given to Indians, and among the more progressive the policy of pushing the Indian to the front is being consciously adopted. This is a door of hope. Her own children will woo the heart of India to her Saviour.

The history of the past century and the condition of India to-day fill the prescient soul with the certainty that the Kingdom of Christ is coming.

J. N. FARQUHAR.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE EUROPEAN CONCERT CANNOT FIND THE TUNE.

THE Macedonian problem we have always had with us during the past thirty years; and, unless appearances are unusually deceptive, we are likely to continue to have it with us for many years to come. Not that it is insoluble. Very far from that. Any one of the Great Powers which have been fumbling and botching it since the signing of the Treaty of Berlin might have settled it definitively single-handed. It is merely a matter of adjusting means to ends. But all the Powers on the globe cannot accomplish the task so long as they shrink from employing the only efficacious means. And that is precisely what the Concert of the six European Powers persist in doing. They exchange notes, make representations to the Porte, form groups among themselves, exhort the wretched population of Macedonia to patience, and when a decisive act would bring their professed object within the sphere of realities they draw back. First one recoils, frankly giving as a reason that the proposals would prove efficient. Then another turns tail because its rôle is to play second fiddle to the first; the others follow suit in quick succession, each one professing more poignant regret than the backsliders who went before. It was thus from the outset, and it would be cruel to bid the Slavs of Macedonia hope that it will be otherwise for years to come. The Powers, however, claim that at least they are unanimous. And their claim may be allowed. The musicians are, indeed, all playing, although no tune results. As the Prince de Ligne once expressed it: *Le congrès danse mais ne marche pas.*

Under these conditions "The Macedonian Question" has come to be a term with two meanings: it may connote either the condition of the ill-starred inhabitants of the three vilayets, Salonica,

Monastir and Kossovo, or else the latest moods and movements of the Powers ostensibly interested in improving it. When, therefore, we are told that the recent Russian note on the subject has ushered in a new phase of the "Macedonian problem," it is but natural that we should ask which of these two aspects is referred to. Is there merely another change in the grouping of the Powers, or are there also grounds for anticipating surcease of misery for the Christian Slavs of the misruled provinces? Unhappily, even a cursory glance is enough to show that the Russian note is calculated at most to give a fresh turn to the diplomatic kaleidoscope, producing a new figure that closely resembles the old one. And beyond this it would be rash to expect anything. *Plus ça change plus c'est la même chose.*

The penultimate figure of the kaleidoscope—the Austro-Russian combination—was formed in 1897. Russia and Austria-Hungary then agreed to pursue a Balkan policy based on the maxim—let sleeping dogs lie, for awhile. *Quies non movere*. To this negative understanding was added, six years later, a positive project known as the Murzsteg Programme of Reforms. At Murzsteg, in Austria, a few mild measures were outlined for the redressing of grievances that had become intolerable in the three provinces, such as insecurity of life and property and the impossibility of getting justice for Christians in Turkish courts. To these crying abuses the Porte was blind, and to all diplomatic representations on the subject it was deaf. Hence Russia and Austria, as Europe's delegates, were to see that such elementary conditions of every political community as security of life and property and the administration of justice were realised. The aim was modest, the plan seemed practical, the motives were humane and the outlook accordingly brightened. Two Powers, it was thought, would find it easier to influence the Porte than six; and if Austria and Russia—the rivals of yesterday—agreed to compose their differences and work together to help the nationalities of Macedonia, it seemed reasonable to anticipate a considerable measure of success from their efforts. They accordingly set to work in 1903. The Porte reluctantly chimed in, appointing an Inspector-General—Hilmi Pasha,—and each of the two Powers delegated a representative who had the right of drawing the Inspector's attention to public grievances and reporting to his respective Embassy, but was not authorised to do much else. Thus the two civil agents might take snapshots of a gruesome massacre or indite a graphic account of the burning of a village; but they had no authority to prevent these misdeeds or to bring the criminals to justice. And powerless as the Austrian and Russian civil agents were, the representatives of the other Powers—the members of the Financial Commission—were more impotent still. The Inspector-General, too,—Hilmi Pasha,—is said to lack certain essential qualifications. Not being independent of the Porte he is not quite free

from bias. He would be superhuman if he were. The zeal for reform which he displays in the presence of the European agents gives place, it is alleged, to very sturdy conservatism in his reports to Constantinople. In a word, he has the reputation of being Spenlow and Jorkins in one, and his system of administration is said to consist in making the civil agents move like squirrels in a cage-wheel, turning the wheel rapidly enough, but remaining in the same place.

THE AUSTRO-RUSSIAN PARTNERSHIP IS A FAILURE.

Now that Austro-Russian combination was essentially a diplomatic move. For the population of the three vilayets it accomplished hardly anything. Outrages by Turkish troops and officials, then rife, have indeed been diminished by the presence of the European officers and the creation of the gendarmerie. The collection of the taxes and the management of the finances have also been improved by the Financial Commission, as Sir Edward Grey pointed out in his despatch of March 3rd. But take it all in all, and the lot of the people of the three vilayets, after eleven years of Austro-Russian efforts, is not only not better but worse. As Sir Edward Grey expressed it in his memorable despatch, "other evils have arisen which "have counteracted, or even more than counteracted, the good effect "of the whole of the improvement. The strife between the different "nationalities and the outrages committed by armed bands have made "life and property in Macedonia more insecure than ever, and have "been accompanied by revolting crimes, such as that at Dragosh "recently, where five men, ten women and eleven children were "deliberately burned alive in their houses."

Admittedly then the Austro-Russian agreement and the Mürzsteg Programme were dismal failures. This allegation has been proved conclusively by the facts summarised in Sir Edward Grey's despatch, chief among which is Turkey's lack of firm resolve to root out the evils complained of,—nay, one might say her resolve to perpetuate them. For instance, the destructive action of the bands who kill and rob and burn might easily be checked if the troops were properly utilised. There are some hundred and sixty thousand soldiers quartered in the three provinces, and the charge on the local budget for their keep is, as Sir Edward Grey puts it, "an intolerable "financial burden." And to make matters worse, the soldiers are practically useless. For they will never move about at night, whereas the bands always do. Hence the former find no work, whereas the latter encounter no obstacles, and the population suffers heavily from both. The peaceful peasantry is thus crushed between hammer and anvil. And certain of the Powers, being in favour of keeping them so, suggested that present conditions be prolonged, and the mandates of the civil agents and financial commissioners be

renewed. They add, it is true, that the proposed judicial reforms should be introduced. But, as Sir Edward Grey wrote, these measures "would not pacify the country and they would not lessen "or touch appreciably the worst evils from which the country is now "suffering, nor could they arrest the campaign of murder and "violence." Why, then, discuss them as though they were infallible specifics for the ills of the population of Macedonia?

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY AND RUSSIA EXPLAIN.

For those reasons, among others, his Majesty's Secretary for Foreign Affairs drafted a remarkable memorandum, which was communicated to the Ambassadors of the European Powers in London on December 18th. In this breezy document a spade is called a spade, and effective methods are advocated. Thus it is plainly stated that the gendarmerie, which might cope successfully with the bands, ought to be substantially increased; that the Turkish troops, which now connive at brigandage and massacres, should be largely reduced in numbers; and that the money thus saved should be applied to the maintenance of the increased gendarmerie. This, one might think, was a business-like proposal which, if acted upon, might have gone far to render crime less rife and life and property more secure. Even the friends of Turkey could not well object to it without exposing themselves to the suspicion of being also the friends of chronic disorder in Macedonia. And yet it was rejected by the Christian Powers, whose one absorbing care is alleged to be the welfare of the Slav peoples of the three vilayets.

Austria and Russia indited a memorandum* which cannot be read without a grim smile. They would gladly—most gladly—rescue the miserable Slavs from pillage, incendiarism, murder—but how? Ah! if they only knew how! By withdrawing Turkish troops and adding to the number of gendarmes? Surely not—for "in the "opinion of the competent military authorities who have been consulted, no increase, however considerable, in the gendarmerie "could replace the Turkish troops in the work of repressing the "bands." Those tried Turkish troops would thus seem to be veritable treasures to the people of Macedonia. In other words, Russia and Austria are unwilling to substitute gendarmes for soldiers chiefly because the military experts condemned the measure as pernicious. Really? So, at least, the Russian and Austrian Foreign Ministers solemnly asserted. And yet, odd though it may sound, the statement was a mis-statement, the memory of the Russian and Austrian diplomatists having played them false. It must have given pain to Sir Edward Grey when composing his

* This document is dated 28th January. It enumerates five objections to Sir Edward Grey's proposals, each of which was satisfactorily refuted by the British Foreign Secretary in his second communication of the 3rd March.

trenchant reply to have to inform the Austrian and Russian Governments that competent military authorities affirmed just the contrary, and that the competent authorities in question were precisely the representatives of Austria and Russia. "His Majesty's Government would point out that the question of employing the gendarmerie for the repression of the bands was discussed at the recent Conference of the 'Adjoints' of the Great Powers at Constantinople in "a memorandum signed by those present, including the Adjoints of "Austria-Hungary and Russia." Paragraph II of this Memorandum deals with a proposal presented by the Adjoint of Austria-Hungary, proposing that the pursuit of the bands should be entrusted to the gendarmerie, whose members should be considerably increased. From this plain statement of fact then we learn that not only did the competent military authorities approve the plan, but they actually took the initiative in laying it before the Conference. And *mirabile dictu*, the mover of this proposal was the representative of Austria-Hungary, whose words and acts his Government so completely forgot that they reversed them. One cannot repress a movement of pity for the ill-starred population of Macedonia whose vital interests turn thus upon the failing memory of benevolent diplomatists.

One can divine the feeling from which the concluding forcible passage of Sir Edward Grey's comment emanated: "In view of that "unanimous expression of opinion by the military experts on the "spot, His Majesty's Government cannot admit that the principle "of employing an increased and mobile gendarmerie in place of the "Turkish troops for the repression of the bands is either un- "practical or impossible, and they regret to find the Austro- "Hungarian and Russian Governments have found themselves "unable to support the proposals put forward or supported by their "own 'Adjoints'." A more scathing criticism of the political scribes it would be difficult to point to in the annals of modern European diplomacy.

None of the Governments, although they are all quite eager for the weal of the Macedonian peoples, accepted the modest British proposals. Indeed, the two guardians of Macedonia—Austria-Hungary and Russia—gave it as their deliberate opinion that the present moment is "singularly inopportune for advancing fresh "proposals."* They did not precisely object to fresh proposals; they were merely waiting for an auspicious moment to make them. *Rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis*. And yet Russia herself came forward with fresh proposals a few weeks later, heedless that the moment was so singularly inopportune. Thus logic fared almost as badly as humanity. Otherwise no doubt the humane Governments of Austria-Hungary and Russia would have

* In their joint reply of January 28th to the British proposals of December 18th.

hesitated to sign such a plea as this: "At present the responsibility for the suppression of the bands falls on Turkey. It cannot be in the interests of the Powers to transfer this responsibility to their own officers. . . ." Why not? One would have thought that to accept responsibility for suppressing the bands and then promptly to suppress them was precisely a condition *sine quâ non* of peace in the three vilayets. On the other hand, to shift responsibility on to the broad shoulders of the Turk and to allow fire and sword to go on devastating the land and decimating the population is a policy that does violence to one's notions of the "mission of the two culture-bearing nations." The Macedonian population craves for peace, whereas the two Powers seek only to shirk responsibilities. The unfortunate Slavs of Kossovo, Monastir and Salonica remind one of the trout caught for dinner to which two wrangling cooks appealed to decide their dispute, and say with which of the proposed sauces it had better be eaten, "But I don't want to be eaten at all," replied the trout. "My dear fish," was the reply, "you are wandering from the subject."

RUSSIA'S MODEST PROPOSALS.

A keen consciousness of these incongruities of the diplomatic game, as played by the two guardian Powers, would seem to have inspired Sir Edward Grey's communication of the 3rd March, in which a demand was made for the appointment of a governor-general, who should administer the three provinces and be irremovable by the Porte. That document, or else an awakened consciousness of those same incongruities, called forth fresh proposals from Russia, who had so recently declared the moment singularly unfavourable for any fresh proposals. But *tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis*. These new suggestions, enshrined in the Aide-Mémoire which Count Benckendorff communicated to the British Foreign Office on the last day of March, evince a genuine desire to meet our Government half way. Russia tries to contemplate the situation from the English angle of vision, admits the need of sweeping reforms within the limits of the feasible, and then lays down her own concrete project. The main point in this scheme is that the members of the Financial Commission who represent Great Britain, Germany, France, and Italy shall in future exercise the same rights as the two civil agents delegated by Russia and Austria-Hungary. All the delegates of the Powers are therefore to be equal henceforward. This clause deals a death-blow to the Austro-Russian partnership, but it gives cold comfort to the Macedonians. And the Liberal Russian Press applauds it. Even such a radical organ as the *Russ* fancies that the wretched people of the three vilayets care as much about the bickerings of the Powers as about their own lives and property. That journal writes: "Russia's proposals, modest though they be,

"offer the population of Macedonia at least one important guarantee :
 "henceforth in Macedonia the leading part will not be played by
 "that great Power which has proved ever most dangerous to its
 "future. The hegemony of Austria-Hungary, inaugurated by the
 "Mürzsteg Agreement, is drawing to a close, and that perspective
 "will unite all Macedonians without distinction of race in a sentiment
 "of great satisfaction."* This is interesting. The trout then has a
 wish to be eaten with a certain sauce. If the wishes and needs of
 the Slavs of Macedonia really lay in this direction and could be
 satisfied by diplomatic modifications of this kind, it would follow
 that the grievances of that people are sentimental rather than real.

Another concession made by the Russian Foreign Minister is that
 the General who commands and reorganises the gendarmerie shall
 be authorised to be present at the meetings of the Financial Com-
 mittee, but without the right of voting. This innovation might
 perhaps gratify the Italian General in question, but it certainly would
 not accomplish much else. Neither would any noteworthy benefit
 accrue from a slight increase in the gendarmerie to which Russia
 also coldly assents, because the effect of the measure is thwarted by
 the rider that in the future, as in the past, Ottoman troops and not
 the gendarmes shall be charged with the work of dispersing the
 marauding gangs. "Let the blood shed be on Turkey's head" would
 appear to be the maxim. A real innovation is the organising of
 rural guards, who would be armed by the communes and paid by them
 too, if wages were a consideration. Lastly, the civil agents and the
 members of the Financial Commission might enter the service of
 the Shadow of Allah and wear the fez, should the Sultan so desire.
 To this plight has Russia come in the year of grace 1908, that she
 deems it wise to authorise her own representatives to wear the badge
 of subjection to the Mohammedan Caliph, and to wear it in daily and
 hourly presence of the Christian Slavs who have been wont to liken
 themselves to Andromeda, Turkey to the sea monster, and Russia
 to Perseus, who was to slay the monster and liberate his intended
 victim. More ominous than this is Russia's refusal to insist on the
 adoption of a system of administration for the three vilayets of
 Macedonia such as has been tried with success in Lebanon: a
 Governor-General to be appointed by the Porte with the approval
 of the Powers, and to be irremovable without the consent of the
 Powers. "Whilst in principle favouring this plan," writes the
 Russian Foreign Office, "we are compelled to recognise that it has
 "no chance of being adopted unanimously by the Powers nor
 "accepted by the Sultan." This recognition is followed by a proposal
 which doubtless the Cabinets will adopt unanimously and the Sultan
 will accept: the powers of the Inspector-General are to be prolonged
 for seven years more.

* *Russ*, 18th April.

THE RUSSIAN SCHEME MAKES NO RADICAL CHANGE.

Such are the main points of the Russian counter-proposal. "They are almost identical with those of Great Britain," we are told by several Continental journals and one Foreign Minister. Almost? In reality an abyss divides them. Russia's proposals do not go to the two-fold root of the matter: the pressing need of money and the necessity of an administration in Macedonia which shall be virtually independent of the Sultan. Until these two conditions are fulfilled there will be a Macedonian Question. This is a truism even for the cursory newspaper reader. Security for life and property depends on the complete suppression of the bands of cut-throats, "firebugs" and marauders who now lay waste the country. Ottoman troops will not effect this. Although there are 150,000 of them in the three provinces already, the hordes of murderers and incendiaries do their gory work unchecked. Mobile gendarmes, if there were enough of them, would soon put an end to terrorism. But gendarmes must be paid. And where is the money to come from?

The Macedonian budget is slender at best, and it shrinks very sensibly when the cost of keeping the soldiery in the three vilayets is paid. And the Porte insists on making that a charge on the budget. That is one cardinal factor of the situation. No corresponding benefits accrue to the people of Macedonia from the presence of all these Ottoman troops. In fact there is hardly any benefit at all, relative or absolute. Therefore it would be wise to reduce them considerably, argued Sir Edward Grey, and the saving thus effected might be applied to the maintenance of an increased body of gendarmerie. But the Tsar's advisers demur to this. The troops of the Sultan, they hold, should not be reduced in number nor even the question discussed. Against enlarging the gendarmerie Russia had no objection to offer, but she cannot approve the idea of allowing them to put down the bands. Russian Slavs suppressing Macedonian Slavs would be the abomination of desolation. It is bad enough for an Orthodox Russian to debase himself to the point of wearing the fez and serving the Sultan, but to shoot and slay and wound Orthodox Slavs whose only crime is patriotism and to be paid for the service by the Caliph—that would indeed be the quintessence of apostacy. So the question cannot even be discussed.

The institution of "rural guards," on the contrary, commands the approbation of the Tsar's Minister. In each village a certain number of rustics would be chosen by the authorities, properly equipped, armed and authorised to protect their villages from the aggression of the smaller gangs, and if numerous bands were moving about—well, the matter would be duly reported to the gendarmerie. It is easy to see that this remedy, like most of the others, is no cure for the evil. To begin with, the institution of rural guards or *bekdjis* is

discredited. Hitherto they have been wolves employed as shepherds. In the west of the Vardar, for instance, they were generally Albanian "killers"—professional bravi, armed to the teeth, who would slay a man without compunction, just to keep their hand in, and who literally *possessed* the whole canton, and compelled it to pay tribute. So complete was the power of these predatory guardians that they claimed and exercised the mediæval *jus prima noctis*. Under the new arrangements it would no doubt be possible to exercise supervision over these and other equally undesirable elements; but wholly to eliminate them would be extremely difficult. It should be borne in mind that most of the rank and file of the bands are taken from the Macedonian villages. Arm them at the cost of the budget, and you are striving to cast out devils by Beelzebub.

RUSSIA LEAVES THE FINANCIAL PROBLEM UNSOLVED.

But suppose these difficulties overcome, the financial aspect of the matter would still have to be faced. Whence is the money to come for the payment of these rural guards? Not from the Budget, Russia answers, for that is inadequate to the heavy charges already made upon it, and shows a deficit of £300,000. It has been timidly suggested that if the rural guards must have salaries, the village communes should provide the funds. But the villagers are overtaxed as it is. The bulk of them cannot support an additional burden. And why should they be asked to bear it, seeing that the Porte is arranging to pay certain sums towards the construction of three new sections of the Baghdad Railway, and leaving its debt to the Macedonian Budget of £300,000 unpaid? In other words, then, there is no source from which the money for the rural guards can be drawn, excepting that indicated by Sir Edward Grey for the support of the gendarmes—the savings on the reduction of the number of Ottoman troops. And this reduction Russia refuses even to discuss. On the other hand, it is inconceivable that the rural guards, however well intentioned, would give their services—if they could give them—without any remuneration. Consequently the Russian suggestion lands us in a no thoroughfare.

OTTOMAN RULE IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH REAL REFORM.

The other root of the Macedonian problem is an administration independent of the Porte. So long as the Turkish Government possesses the right to interfere, it will always put a spoke in the wheel of the reform machinery. That is a self-evident proposition. Russians, as well as Englishmen, discern it clearly. One of the best authorities on the subject, A. A. Bashmakoff, Jurisconsult of the

Russian Foreign Office, presented a memorandum to Count Lamsdorff in 1903, pointing out this cardinal fact. And the Russian proposals contained in the *Aide-Mémoire* of the 31st March are not a whit more effective than was the scheme enshrined in the Austro-Russian Memorandum of 1903. And what my friend Bashmakoff wrote of that memorandum may be aptly applied to the present project: "While it contains nothing capable of checking the arbitrary Ottoman misgovernment, it dispels for a time the fear entertained at Constantinople that a real in lieu of a seeming intervention of the Powers would be resorted to."

Adequate reforms would have been introduced in the three vilayets a quarter of a century ago had it not been for the Sultan, who is jealous of his power and anxious for the integrity of his dominions. And truth compels us to admit that real reform would of necessity deal a blow to both. A virtually autonomous Macedonia would probably for most purposes be lost to the Ottoman Empire, and would gravitate to Bulgaria. Crete and Samos are still officially regarded as integral parts of Turkey, but the fiction is meant to soothe the Sultan's *amour propre* rather than connote the international status of those islands. In the case of the Macedonian vilayets the amputation would be equally real and much more painful. Hence the friends of justice have to choose between two alternatives: reform to be carried only against the Sultan's will and by impairing his sovereign rights, or else the maintenance of his sovereign rights by abandoning the idea of reform. It must be one thing or the other.

GERMANY CONDUCTS THE CONCERT AND THE CONCERT BAULKS REFORM.

The Concert of the Powers pronounced emphatically in favour of the Sultan's rights, and consequently for the putting off of adequate measures of relief *sine die*. Why? Because Germany, as the friend and ally of the Turk, had laid it down that the Sultan's sovereign rights must be respected by every international group of which she forms part. The Habsburgs being at one with the Hohenzollerns, the other Powers have had to choose between assent to this fatal limitation and the breaking up of the European Concert. Here again, therefore, it must be one thing or the other. It is not possible to conceive a third course between the two extremes. The Concert then, as at present constituted, will not insist upon, will not even plead for efficacious measures of improvement for Macedonia. Therefore, to uphold this international combination is virtually to renounce the cause of reform. The issue is clear. Prince Bülow himself, during a recent Reichstag debate, spoke frankly on the subject, condemning Sir Edward Grey's scheme as harmful. "We

"cannot be expected," he said, "to evince any warmth for proposals which we do not deem efficient, and which we hold to be even dangerous. Among the latter we include innovations which would imperil the sovereignty of the Sultan, and thus provoke Turkey and her Mahommedan population to extreme resistance." Now this maxim, however little it may be relished by other Powers, must be acted upon by all, so long as the Concert is kept up. But it would at least be a relief to the world generally if this fact were openly recognised, and no further efforts made to dangle before the eyes of the Macedonian population hopes which are not destined to be fulfilled.

The objection to a Governor-General of the three vilayets is that it would be a whittling away of the sovereign rights of the Sultan. And it would. Hence Russia suggested that something less should be demanded, that the Inspector-General should be confirmed for another seven years. But his powers are to be illusory as heretofore. The argument against authorising him, as Sir Edward Grey has suggested, to employ the troops, ratify the Budget, appoint and dismiss officials, is that that would take away from the sovereignty of the Sultan. And doubtless it would. Lastly, the reason why the representatives of the six European States are not transformed into a Board of Local Government, is that this measure also would shear the Sultan of his prestige and curtail his power in three important provinces. And the argument in this, as in the other cases, is well founded but not convincing. For the Berlin Treaty for which such deep respect is professed does itself curtail the Sultan's sovereign rights by insisting on reforms in Armenia and Macedonia and warranting, nay, obliging the Powers to intervene in Turkey's domestic affairs. Now in these interventions Germany, however reluctantly, has hitherto always taken part. And what is true of Germany in this respect applies equally to Russia, whose attitude surprised her Bulgarian and Macedonian *protégés*. Why, they ask, do the Tsar's advisers strain at a gnat if they swallow a camel? Why reject a set of proposals that would free the Macedonian population from an intolerable state of thralldom and misery, on the ground that Russia cannot jointly guarantee the integrity of the Sultan's dominions? In truth, Russia is already one of the Powers that guarantee that integrity. She signed the Treaty of Paris, and in virtue of §7 of that document she solemnly accepted the obligation from which she now recoils.

RUSSIA FOLLOWED GERMANY'S LEAD.

Russian statesmen apparently assume that before speaking the plain truth to the Sultan their country must be ready for war, and as this readiness is problematical, they set wisdom before daring. And to this decision there can be no serious objection if the grounds

for it are plainly stated. For it is no disgrace to be temporarily unable to discharge a task if illness or misfortune be the hindering cause. It would, however, be disingenuous to pretend you were performing it when you were not, and knew that you were not. Those who feign to see no material difference between the scheme elaborated by Sir Edward Grey and the amendments drafted by M. Izvolsky are beyond the reach of argument. Even Russians who approve and Russians who disapprove the policy of their Government frankly admit that an abyss divides them. "The Russian project," writes the *Novoye Vremya*,

is marked by one characteristic trait: while it outlines a set of transformations it really leaves all things just where they were. The same Inspector General stays on, the same international commission, the same gendarmerie, the same troops. And the European Commission will play substantially the same part as heretofore—the part of good advisers whose advice is taken or spurned at the whim of a Turkish Pasha—the Inspector General.*

Even Turkey indirectly acknowledged that Russia's scheme was acceptable, for the Sultan not only graciously invited the Tsar's Ambassador to a gala dinner, but organised a complete theatrical representation for M. Zinovieff's special delectation. The *Novoye Vremya*, however, still maintaining its ground, wrote somewhat later:—

In the interests of humanity we would fain see the European Powers accept the British proposals in the form in which they were drawn up. For they embody the smallest measure of reasonable demands. Anything less than this bodes nothing good in the future.†

Since then the British Foreign Office, yielding to necessity, has narrowed down its desiderata. One of the most important of the modified proposals is that the cost of the civil administration should be treated as a first charge on the revenues of the three provinces, and only the balance applied to military purposes. The effect of this salutary measure would be to ease the population which is now overburdened with taxation, and to provide the wherewithal for further relief in future. Our Foreign Office also agrees that in lieu of a Governor-General the Inspector-General might be maintained at the head of the administration, but holds that he should be raised to the rank of a Vizier, should not be liable to dismissal without the consent of the Powers, who would also guarantee him his pension after retirement, and that he should be authorised to approve the Budget, command mobile troops, and appoint and dismiss officials in concert with the Financial Commission. If these terms are approved and pressed by the Concert and accepted by the Porte, the British Government will have merited well of the population of Macedonia. If!

* *Novoye Vremya*, 27th March.

† *Novoye Vremya*, 1st April.

THE MACEDONIAN QUESTION IS BUT AN ASPECT
OF A GREATER INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM.

It is natural to dwell on the pusillanimity of those Powers who would gladly better the lot of the Sultan's Slav subjects provided they could do so without grave risk. But it is only fair to remember that there is another point of view, from which the interests of the Macedonian people form but a part of a much more important international problem, and perhaps a smaller part than we are at first likely to realise. And that is the point of view of the peace of Europe. If the "little brethren" of the Russians cannot be rescued without bringing on a conflict among the Powers, then the task had indeed better be set aside until its accomplishment becomes less costly. For it is a universally recognised maxim that the greater must not be sacrificed for the less. Doubtless, Europe as well as the Turk has much to answer for if it be true that thirty thousand Slavs have been massacred in the three vilayets since the Treaty of Berlin was signed. But none the less it would be bad policy to safeguard the lives of a few more thousand Slavs there by occasioning a war that would cause the death of a hundred thousand Russians, Bulgarians and Turks. The imminent risk of that holocaust is the lowest price at which, to the thinking of the most experienced and gifted politicians of the Old World, the Powers could obtain the redemption of Macedonia. And that price has been fixed by the Sultan's friend and ally, Germany. Why?

Here we are on thorny ground. But it is quite possible so to pick our steps that we shall never lose contact with facts. The one cardinal fact on which the policy of Russia and France hinges is the firm and reasonable belief of those humane statesmen with whom the final decision lay, that to accept the British proposals of the 3rd March would have been to render war almost inevitable. It cannot, of course, be proved that hostilities would have broken out as a matter of absolute necessity. It may, however, be affirmed with emphasis that those who are best able to gauge aright the consequences of the two alternative policies, and who were most eager to help Macedonia, raised their voices against our Government's project on the ground that its ultimate consequence would be war, and a war in which Great Britain would take no part. And this is no mere probable hypothesis. The rooted belief existed, and exists, and its roots are hard facts. It will be a thousand pities, therefore, if the reflections aroused by this defeat of the Cabinets favourable to Macedonia do not become potent agencies in preparing the minds of the public for a broader and sounder view of the political situation than has hitherto prevailed. It is not only useless but dangerous to blink the fact that Germany is becoming virtually mistress of the European situation, that her wishes must be consulted, not only

by isolated States but by groups of allied Powers. Hence for a Foreign Secretary to insist upon a line of action which, however humane, runs counter to Germany's interests or wishes, would be to expose his country to grave risks without any compensating advantages. Thus the statesman of the era just inaugurated will have to content himself with doing what is expedient, and vainly regretting that he is powerless to attempt what he knows to be right.

WITH GERMANY ALL THINGS SEEM POSSIBLE.

For the political world is visibly undergoing a transformation, more complete, it may be, than that which was ushered in by the French Revolution, and on our continent Germany is the State that seems the best equipped for the struggle for national existence under the new conditions—conditions which she has herself materially contributed to bring about. She has certainly won for herself a commanding position unexampled in history, and won it by dint of systematic efforts, most of which challenge our admiration. No such thoroughly organised State has sprung up since the dawn of history. No political community has ever yet wielded such formidable land and sea forces as Germany, or possessed a staff better able to employ them to her own advantage. France believes in her power and trembles. The master of these forces, the war-lord, had but to express the wish, and France's Minister of Foreign Affairs was removed. No Power can face Germany single-handed. No two Powers combined would venture to provoke her enmity. Alliances, indeed, she might formerly have feared, but for them, too, she is now fully prepared. Austria-Hungary—at least so long as the reign of the Emperor Franz Josef endures—is Germany's ally, or rather, her *alter ego*. At Algeciras Austria played the part of Germany's second in a duel that ought to have been a humane Congress. In the Balkan Peninsula, Austria and Germany are so entirely one that they might be likened to the Siamese Twins. So powerful is the mutual attraction of the two States generally that a political party in the Austrian Reichsrath clamours for annexation to Germany. Desirous of keeping Italy within the Triple Alliance, Kaiser Wilhelm—not the Emperor Franz Josef—gave an undertaking to Italy that Austria would never seek to annex Albania. The fact appears incredible, but it is true. "Be assured," Kaiser Wilhelm remarked to the Italian Senator, Duke Andria, "be assured that Austria harbours no designs on Italy." The Duke, however, not feeling assured, alluded to Austria's policy in Albania and the Adriatic. But the Kaiser made answer: "I empower you to tell your colleagues in Parliament and your friends in the Press that the German Emperor has assured you that Austria harbours no designs against Italy." *Imperator locutus est, causa*

fixata est. Already the German Kaiser speaks authoritatively in the name of Austria-Hungary, and acts boldly in the interests of Turkey, Morocco and Persia. That he sees his way to still greater heights than this, may be gathered from his having lately ordered of the sculptor, Walter Schott, a life-size statue of himself in the garb of a Roman Emperor, his left hand holding his mantle, a marshal's baton in his right, and the terrestrial globe under his right foot serving as a footstool.*

Austria and Germany will therefore remain fast friends through thick and thin. Italy is reckoned upon as a third member of the political firm, and on good grounds. Last summer the Italian Foreign Secretary proclaimed in a semi-official note "the cordial friendship and the perfect understanding between Italy and Austria-Hungary, not merely in the present but also respecting all "eventualities of the future." The Press, too, is on the same side. Consequently Germany has nothing to fear from coalitions, not only because there are no Powers minded to form an aggressive coalition against her, but also because with Austria as an ally and Italy as a well-wisher she could well afford to confront it.

GERMANY ALONE CAN INFLUENCE TURKEY.

Nor is Austria her only staunch friend. Turkey is no less trustworthy, and with proper care may become still more helpful. The Ottoman army, despite bad pay, defective training and incapable commanders, is still a force to be reckoned with. Under German leaders it might become a force to be dreaded. Congruously with the secret military convention which is alleged to be in vigour between the two States, Turkey, being slow to mobilise, would begin quietly and in advance of any visible need, and by a series of operations which, like those that are going on to-day on Russia's frontiers, might be explained as mere local moves or else as indispensable precautions against an impending Armenian insurrection. The Mohammedan Caucasus would then rise to a man against Russian rule, and at least 200,000 soldiers might be kept busy in that part of the Tsar's dominions. I may be allowed to remark in passing that at present, when the Tsar's grip on the Caucasus is become the reverse of tight, a Mohammedan insurrection fomented by Turkey is generally regarded as probable in the near future.

* This harmless whim of the unconventional monarch has been criticised with undue sharpness as a political blunder. In reality it is nothing of the kind. From the artistic and historic points of view it is perhaps open to question whether an ancient Roman Emperor would have allowed himself to go down to posterity in a full-bottomed wig of the time of Louis XIV, and would have had its flowing curls intertwined with laurel leaves, or would have appeared with waxed elaborately trained moustache. On the other hand, it will not be gainsaid that Roman Emperors often had monuments erected to themselves. Caligula is a well-known instance. Again, the earth as a footstool is an attribute of the gods, whose equal each of those Roman Emperors was deemed to be.

But Turkey's helpfulness to Germany is not exhausted by her influence on Russia's subjects. In India, Afghanistan, Morocco, Egypt, in fine wherever the followers of the Prophet are to be found, there the Caliph wields authority, and the Kaiser can put forth influence. Long before he dismissed Bismarck, Wilhelm II. set himself this aim, which he has pursued with praiseworthy constancy ever since. And he has attained it with slender means: moral support extended to the Sultan against the Armenians, the Cretans and the Macedonians has had a marvellous effect on the Caliph, and produced political and economic consequences which can hardly be overrated. To the Kaiser, who lacks Mussulman subjects of his own, these tactics involved no unpleasant entanglements. France, Great Britain and Russia, on the other hand, struck out a Near Eastern policy the very reverse of this: concentrating their energy upon humanitarian aims, they went so far as to exasperate Islam without going far enough to render it powerless for evil. They irritated the Sultan without compelling him to do their bidding, and thus drove him into the alliance with Germany. They probed the wounds of the Sultan's Christian subjects, aggravating the patients' sufferings and leaving the source of their agonies intact. Generosity was the mainspring of this policy, and incapacity for systematic thinking was its bane. The political chart of the philanthropic States was never marked to the end of the trip. One consequence of this antagonism between Islam and the Christian Powers with Moslem subjects was that even political acts of ours which were prompted by sheer interest and devoid of altruistic motives contributed to intensify the hostile feeling towards us which Mohammedans have for years been nursing. Our agreement with France about Egypt and Morocco is a case in point. It confirmed Moslem suspicions throughout Islam. Our clumsy and inadequate action at Constantinople, in favour of Turkish Christians, completed the work of estrangement. Nay, even our understanding with Russia lends itself to a mischievous interpretation, which German agents have eagerly spread, that we have divided up Persia between us. In a word, we have been perseveringly—one might even think systematically—playing into Germany's hands and creating domestic enemies out of excellent Mohammedan citizens. Why? Is this political wisdom? Is it humane conduct? Is it even enlightened egotism? Many common-sense politicians, who would cut the country's coat according to the cloth available, are asking whether it would not have been wiser and more helpful to the cause of humanity and to the best interests of Great Britain to cultivate good relations with Turkey, and then intercede for the Sultan's Christian subjects. However this may be, it will not be gainsaid by any normal British politician that at present millions of our loyal Mohammedan subjects are gradually being transformed

into bitter domestic enemies. And this is a ruinous loss over against which we have absolutely nothing to show.

Nor is lapse of time likely to modify the present state of things to our advantage. France is entangled in Morocco, Russia is floundering about in the Far Eastern bog, while Germany and Turkey are free. In truth, the probabilities lie the other way. If France and Great Britain had succeeded in helping Russia to recover her lost prestige and influence, the balance might be restored and the outlook bettered. And of this consummation there was, until lately, some grounded hope. Russian finances having withstood the fierce onslaughts of the war, the revolution with its strikes and wanton destruction of property and the failure of the harvest, were slowly inspiring renewed confidence. The returns were increasing. Trade and industry appeared to be getting brisker. Gold was coming into the country—in a very slender rivulet, perhaps, but steadily. A vast change, however, has come over the spirit of the dream since the Amoor Railway Bill passed the Duma. Economy, such reasonable economy as would have enabled Russia to right herself and to provide for the pressing needs of the new régime, is now become impossible. A golden stream carrying away the earnings of the peasant, the labourer, and the artisan will henceforth and for a generation flow constantly to the Pacific seaboard, draining the Empire of its vital sap. It is hardly too much to say that the 14th April, when the Bill was carried, will be marked as a *dies nefastus* in Russian history.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE AMOOR RAILWAY BILL.

Adversaries of the Duma blame that body for having hastily voted a Bill which may bring down untold disaster on their country. To my thinking, this accusation is unfair. The bulk of the deputies are utterly incapable of forming a judgment on the tangle of issues involved. Very few of them were able to grasp even the first elements of the question. But knowing just enough to understand that they knew nothing about it, they looked for guidance to the Government, which has the obligation and the means of knowing everything about it. And in this the deputies fulfilled their duty. Another point in their favour which ought not to be forgotten is this: those among them who made a strenuous effort to comprehend what the debates were about, discovered that sooner or later the Amoor Railway ought to be built. Whether now or later they did not know. Being in doubt, therefore, they kept on the safe side by refusing to procrastinate and by making a heavy sacrifice for the national interests. So far the attitude of the Duma.

With the Cabinet it is different. The Ministers possessed valuable information which was beyond the reach of the deputies. And it consisted mostly of data which told powerfully against the project. Not that the Amoor line is a luxury. Its necessity was never seriously disputed by responsible politicians. What was denied is that the very first charge on the revenues of the convalescent Empire should be the construction of a line 1,530 miles long, running through a vast stretch of wilderness, costing over three hundred million roubles and certain to need a further outlay of some thirty million roubles annually for a number of years. Only the most imminent danger would justify such enormous expenditure at a moment when the utmost thrift is indispensable to Russia's recovery from the state of prostration in which she still lies. And there is no ground for believing that any such peril threatens the Russian people, or that genuine dangers would be warded off by hurriedly constructing the new line.

Military considerations moved the Cabinet to bring in the Bill, and a determination not to be baulked of carrying it prompted the tactics they adopted of beginning the work in virtue of an imperial order which the Duma was now asked to confirm. From this mode of action, as well as from other symptoms, it may be gathered that the Amoor Railway is conceived by the Government as an enterprise of strategic significance. The line of reasoning they followed was presumably something like this. The Trans-Siberian Railway which connects European Russia with Vladivostok is excellent in peace time. But it cannot be utilised during a campaign for the purpose of forwarding troops or materials of war because part of it passes through Chinese territory. Therefore, a line must be constructed which will keep on Russian territory from terminus to terminus, because if no such route were made and if hostilities broke out Transbaikalia would be liable to invasion and annexation. That is one argument and the most forcible of all. I am told that it has convinced some people. To many, however, it appears the reverse of cogent. For it may be summarised thus: either the Amoor Railway must be built and all the consequences of the financial sacrifice it entails borne by the nation, or else for a certain number of years Transbaikalia must be exposed to the risk of invasion in case of war. But suppose now the statesmen say: "We had much better run that shadowy risk than drain the country of its life blood, hinder its complete recovery, lose our gold standard and conjure up the very war spectre of which we profess to stand in such dread." This is a tenable view. I know several of Russia's best men and the Tsar's most devoted partisans who hold it. After all, the building of the Amoor Railway involves positive evils which, although one may exaggerate their intensity, are real, and may prove more baleful than one

anticipates. If the money which this line would cost were saved and employed in productive undertakings, Russia would stand to gain, not to lose by the transaction. War is most unlikely; therefore, the risk of losing Transbaikalia is shadowy. But even were it otherwise, if an armed conflict broke out, between a Mongol State and Russia, it is by no means certain that Russia would again be worsted. If, however, she were, it would not follow necessarily that Transbaikalia would be severed from the rest of the Empire. But even if that happened, it would only be for a short time, and the loss of that stretch of sparsely inhabited land would not perceptibly alter the course of Russia's national life or the rate of her marvellous growth.

In the one scale, therefore, there are consequences of the Bill which may greatly damage the nation's vital interests. In the opposite scale there is but one risk, which cannot become real unless Russia embarks on another Far Eastern campaign, and which even then might imply nothing very terrible.

THE AMOOR RAILWAY BILL PRESUPPOSES A FAR EASTERN CAMPAIGN.

Is another Far Eastern campaign so probable then that this railway must be built at an enormous cost before proper surveys or trustworthy estimates have been made? "Storm clouds are gathering on 'the horizon,' we are told, 'and no man knows when they will burst. 'China is awakening, Japan is growing, plans of campaign are 'maturing.' But there is nothing to warrant this pessimism. M. Izvolsky, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, in his much applauded speech to the Duma, described Russia's relations with Japan as neighbourly in the present and destined to become quite friendly in the future. The conventions recently concluded between the two Powers dispelled the last cloudlet in the political firmament. Peaceful development is now and henceforth the great aim of both nations. It may be assumed that M. Izvolsky knew full well what he was asserting, and that his forecast is worthy of trust. It is repeated by Japanese statesmen and confirmed by tangible facts of everyday experience. To ignore these data that point in the direction of peace, and openly to assume that war is so imminent that it may be expected within five years, is to stimulate your future foe to vie with you. And the result of this dangerous competition may well be the war which neither side wished for.

But assuming for argument's sake that war in the Far East is a dead certainty within the next five years, may one also assume that the Amoor Railway alone will ensure Russia against defeat there? Military experts, men like Generals Subbotitch and Kuropatkin, answer No. It will help her even less than the East Chinese Rail-

way helped her against Japan. Yet the Chinese line ran through territory occupied by the Russians, who retreated from before the enemy although the railway was behind them and secure from attack. The new line, on the other hand, will be in continual danger—when ever war is declared—along a stretch of one thousand miles, because Manchuria is being rapidly colonised by the Japanese, who will be able to co-operate with their troops in attacks on the railway. Moreover, it is difficult to conceive the Russian General Staff devising any plan by which a vast region almost devoid of inhabitants could be successfully defended at a distance of six thousand miles from the heart of the Empire. During the war with Japan the numerous Russian army was fed with the corn that grew in Manchuria. Without that source of supplies no army of that struggle could have been supported there for a month. The thing is impossible. Now in the next war it will be much more difficult to get supplies of food and fodder from Manchuria, and correspondingly difficult to support an adequate army there. Again, the East Chinese Railway is serviceable enough in peace time. Immediately after war had been declared the Mongolian enemy would strive to seize it, and being on the spot would probably succeed. That is the principal objection to the Chinese line. But the same danger will threaten the Amoor Line. What is there to hinder the Japanese from crossing the river and seizing the railway? Nothing. It would be such a god-send to them as the city of Dalny was. Thus in the opinion of experts, whose judgment cannot be disregarded, the advantages of the Amoor Railway over the East Chinese Railway will be infinitesimal.

PROBABLE DISASTROUS CONSEQUENCES OF THE AMOOR RAILWAY BILL.

M. Stolypin, who came forward as the spokesman of the Cabinet, pleaded warmly for the Bill, but failed to kindle a spark of the enthusiasm that had rewarded his best oratorical efforts on previous occasions. He laid special stress on the alleged advantages which the line would confer on the nation by acting as a channel for the stream of migration that flows eastwards every year. To colonise this region is the aim of the Government, he said, and ought to be the desire of the Duma. Well, it is the desire of the Duma, but it is as the desire of the moth for the star. The Ussuri line, which has existed now for eleven years, was expected to work wonders in colonising the country, but it failed. During those eleven years the total increase—including the excess of births over deaths—has been 130,000 individuals all told. Yet the attractions of the Ussuri province are much more potent than those of the regions which the Amoor Railway will traverse. Suppose, however, that the projected

line did succeed in bringing colonists into the district at the same rate as the Ussuri Railway, the result after thirty years would not exceed two and a half millions, whereas the increase of Mongols in neighbouring Manchuria will amount to twenty millions. To the Russian the conditions of the life-struggle in the Amoor Valley are distinctly unfavourable. He cannot compete with the Chinaman or the Jap in any of the trades and callings that flourish there. The Mongolian standard of living is much less costly, and the thrift and sobriety of Chinese and Jap are above temptation. At present the Russian peasants living there are subsidised by the Imperial Government,—a costly method of colonisation which could not, of course, be persisted in when the population increase perceptibly. It is probable, as M. Stolypin pointed out, that the mineral wealth hidden away in the mountains is considerable. But will the building of the railway extract it from the ground? Evidently not. The Caucasus, the Urals, Siberia are striking instances that railways cannot supply the lack of enterprise and perseverance.

Few of those who have written or spoken on the Amoor Railway scheme have laid sufficient stress on its financial aspect, probably because the Premier slurred over it in a lordly sort of way as though a few score or a few hundred million roubles more or less did not really matter. According to the calculation made by the Ministry of Railways the cost will amount to 215,934,250 roubles, exclusive of rolling stock. This estimate, however, is admittedly too low, and should be raised to 260 million roubles. The rolling stock will cost at least forty millions. A branch line connecting the city of Blagoveshtshensk with the Amoor trunk line on the river Zea will necessitate an outlay of about ten million roubles. The total will thus mount up to three hundred and ten million roubles, a sum which represents a loan of about 350 millions and a yearly burden of seventeen million roubles to pay interest on it. When the army in the Far East has been materially increased, as it must and will be, a second track is certain to become necessary, and new bridges will have to be built—in a word, having begun with the Amoor Railway, nobody can tell when and where the end will be. Personally, I feel inclined to fear that one of the first evil consequences of the policy now inaugurated by M. Stolypin will be the loss of the gold standard and a return to paper money.

I cannot help repeating the ominous queries put by an extreme conservatist and patriotic publicist* when writing on the question before the Bill was carried. "How if this Amoor Railway involves "us in just such a war as the East Chinese Railway inflicted on us? "And suppose it provokes an invasion in lieu of protecting us from "it? And how if it turns out that we are about to construct the

* M. Menshikoff.

"railway, not for ourselves but for the dear neighbour who will take possession of it when ready?" It is hard to shake off these misgivings and to banish others of a financial character. General Kuropatkin's opinion recently expressed has convinced me that there will be no end to the expenditure which has just begun. The ex-Commander-in-Chief, who still enjoys the reputation of being Russia's most competent strategist, affirms deliberately that the Amoor Railway alone is utterly insufficient for the protection of the country. That task will necessitate not one but three routes: the East Chinese line, the projected Amoor line and the river Amoor itself, besides a second track to the Siberian Railway. And they will be of little strategic use when ready unless protected by an adequate number of soldiers. An adequate number! What that means in money may be imagined approximately, but it has yet to be translated into figures. In fact, M. Stolypin, fixing upon the Far East as an outlet for Russia's resources, reminds me of Mark Twain's Blue Jay that found an elegant knot-hole in the roof of a house, and set to work to fill it up with acorns. He toiled and moiled like a nigger, heaving acorns into that hole; nor was he disheartened, although he could not get sight of one of them. When at last he could hardly flop his wings, he bent down for a look and, pale with rage, exclaimed: "I've shovelled acorns enough in there to keep the family thirty years, and if I can see a sign of one of 'em I wish I may land in a museum."

It is not for a foreigner to thrust advice upon public men of knowledge and experience who are conscious of their grave responsibilities and are moved by motives of patriotism. But one cannot help speculating as to whether it would not be much more advantageous to the nation to run the risks mentioned above and to go on gaining strength than to plunge into financial and, it may be, political and military disaster. The course inaugurated by M. Stolypin closely resembles that which led to the recent war. In fact it is identical, for it assumes that Russia's eastern frontier must be the sea, and seeks to make it so. Well, the task is virtually the same as that undertaken by Alexeieff, but its difficulty is trebled since Corea and Southern Manchuria have become Japanese and the East Chinese Railway has ceased to be available for Russian troops. It is a task of such magnitude that if it be truly indispensable, the nation ought, figuratively speaking, to turn round from west to east and transfer the capital of the Empire from St. Petersburg to Khabaroffsk, as Peter moved his residence from Moscow to Petersburg once he had resolved to beat down the opposition of the Swedes. And unless the country is now prepared thus to alter its political centre of gravity,

it will only be wasting money, postponing needful reforms, and imitating the Blue Jay.

RUSSIA'S MONEY AND ENERGY ARE NEEDED AT HOME.

The Amoor Railway, as we have seen, has numerous costly corollaries. One of those which we have not seen, however, is the alleged necessity of taking stringent measures against Chinese and Japanese immigration into the country. Restrictive legislation of that kind will, of course, involve continuous friction with neighbours whom it is Russia's interest to have as friends, and one of whom has never yet ceased to be her friend. Moreover, legislation will effect little or nothing. Given Russia's geographical position and the character of the Russian people and the persistence of the Japanese and Chinese, infiltration is almost a law of nature. It cannot be avoided. That at least is the view which dispassionate outsiders take of the necessities and possibilities of natural life in the Amoor Valley.

Lastly, there is the pressing need of internal reform which cannot be long disregarded with impunity. M. Stolypin believes and affirms that the country is quieted and gone back to normal ways. But he may be mistaken. It has certainly gone back to less abnormal ways than those of a year ago, but the democratic movement encouraged by the Cabinet will surely begin anew. And then? The greater part of Russia is still under semi-military law. Capital punishment and long term sentences continue to be common. Doubtless it would be rash to affirm that the crimes committed should be met by more lenient punishment, but the fact remains that the condition of the country is not normal. During the first two months of the year, for example, 417 persons were condemned to death, 179 in January and 238 in February. During those two months the number actually executed was 198, of whom 84 fell in January and 114 in February.

Reorganisation of the police, of the prisons, of the tribunals is a prime necessity. Reorganisation of the army is, if possible, still more urgent. And these changes require money, large sums of money which it will not be easy to raise. Yet instead of spending such money as can be raised in this work of national reorganisation, all available resources will henceforth be drained by the Far East, which might well have waited. It is hard to convince oneself that this policy of M. Stolypin's Cabinet is sound. If Lord Cromer had advocated an expedition to the Soudan before Egyptian finances were established on a solid footing, ruin swift and inevitable would have ensued. And it is highly unlikely that M. Stolypin, with large

odds against him, will succeed where Lord Cromer would certainly have failed. Unless, then, her present Far Eastern policy is reversed, Russia will long remain bereft of her former influence in Europe; France, handicapped in Morocco, must needs abstain from political activity elsewhere; Germany and her *protégés* will have things their own way; Macedonia must patiently wait; and Great Britain may see fit to renounce her humanitarian velleities in favour of the only Power who can now afford to indulge in them.

E. J. DILLON.

THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE LICENSING BILL.

AN interesting feature of the controversy which rages round the Licensing Bill of the Government is the fact that some of those sections of the community which are usually most anxious to uphold the law and maintain the sanctity of contracts, are now spending their time and energy in watering down and explaining away the extremely precise and definite contract into which the State, through Acts of Parliament administered by Licensing Justices, has entered with licence-holders. Under the Act of 1828, which is the governing Act on the subject, an ordinary public-house licence is granted "for one whole year and no longer." When such a licence is granted it terminates at the end of the twelve months, and what is for convenience termed a renewal is really a grant of another licence. Lord Halsbury, when sitting as Lord Chancellor, during the hearing of the Boulter case, in 1897, put this point very clearly to the counsel for the licence-holder:—

"You draw a distinction between the original granting of the licence and the renewal of the licence. One must clear one's mind and see what it is. It is a new licence for the new year. It is important to observe the accuracy of language. It is not a renewal of the licence. It is another licence for another year."

What licence-holders and owners of licensed property have is a licence for the current year and an expectation of its renewal; or, as Lord Selborne, once Lord Chancellor, expressed it, "*a locus standi* for renewal." As the leading representatives of the brewers—Lord Burton, Mr. Samuel Whitbread, and Mr. W. Waters Butler—expressed it in their manifesto which was published on January 27th, this year, what they have always relied upon is "not the right of renewal," but "the expectation of renewal." Clearly, "an expectation" is neither a certainty nor a right. It is a chance.

a possibility, and may be a probability; but there is about it an element of risk and uncertainty.

An expectation may have, and in the case of public-house licences has, a substantial market value, but the fact that the probability that a favour or privilege will be continued has a market value cannot in the slightest degree affect the legal right of the grantor of that favour or privilege to decline to continue it after the time for which it was last granted has expired. That the grantee and others choose to expend money on the strength of their expectation that the privilege which they have had will be continued, cannot in any way diminish the right of the grantor to exercise his legal rights and powers when the time arrives for a further grant of the privilege to be applied for, as it does every year in the case of public-house licences.

It is peculiarly important that the possibility that the grant of the privilege for another year may not be made should always be borne in mind, because the object of instituting licences at all, and especially annual licences, was that the desirability, in the public interest, of continuing or terminating any of them should be periodically and formally considered and determined. Nothing is more clear than that there is no legal right to the renewal of a public-house licence, and that there is not any legal vested interest in such renewal. It is on "an expectation," and an expectation only, that the money which has been vested in licensed premises has been invested.

This indisputable legal position has been dwelt on because it is important that it should be realised most fully, that when it is proposed that time should be given to the liquor trade to prepare itself for the exercise by the State of powers and rights which have lain somewhat dormant, and that during this time levies should be made upon licence-holders in order to provide compensation for those who may lose their licences during this period of transition, this is a concession made, not as a matter of legal right but as an act of grace, a temporary expedient to overcome the difficulties which the imprudent investment of large sums of money in such precarious securities as annual licences has created.

Consequently, when we proceed to consider whether the time notice, which is proposed in the Bill, is adequate, we must remember that any notice is a concession, a gift, an act of grace, and not in any sense a legal right which can be claimed and enforced. Under such circumstances all talk about robbery and confiscation is sheer impertinence. It is the insolent assumption of an annual tenant claiming permanent ownership of a privilege of which he is only the temporary grantee. Nor is it by any means conclusive for interested persons to show that in this, that, or the other case loss will be incurred. The State is under no bond or obligation to enable

investors to recoup themselves for more or less imprudent purchases at precarious and often grossly inflated values. What is offered is a concession, a solatium, to enable the liquor trade to meet a difficulty in which it has unwisely involved itself and for which the nation has no legal responsibility. The proposals of the Licensing Bill must be examined from that point of view. The liquor trade may have interests, but the nation has rights and duties. These largely conflict, and in attempting to adjust them we must not overlook the unquestionable legal right and paramount duty of the State to protect the social and moral well-being of those amongst whom the liquor traffic works such terrible havoc.

What is the financial position of the liquor trade, and what does a time limit of 14 years involve? What amount of capital is invested in this trade, and what is the market value of the licences that will be affected by this Bill? Many estimates have been made. Some of them have been very rash. All talk about the licences of the country being worth £200,000,000 or £300,000,000 is nonsense.

The *Brewers' Almanack* estimates that the capital value of the breweries and distilleries and their licensed premises, together with all the other licensed houses of the United Kingdom, is £230,000,000. In order to obtain the value of the breweries and "on" licensed premises only of England and Wales we must deduct from this figure the capital value of (1) all the breweries and licensed premises in Scotland and Ireland; (2) all the distilleries of the United Kingdom; and (3) such "off" licensed properties as may be included in the £230,000,000. If these deductions be put at £40,000,000 that will give us £190,000,000 as the capital value of the breweries and "on" licensed premises in England and Wales. In 1907 the Brewers' Society made an estimate which yields practically the same result.

If £190,000,000 be the capital value of the breweries and "on" licensed premises of England and Wales, I estimate that the "licence values" of the "on" licensed premises will stand for about half of that sum, say, £95,000,000. The other half will be represented by the breweries, including premises, plant, stock, debts owing to them, and good-will, and the licensed premises, as properties without the licences, and the stock and fittings. Whether these "licence values," as distinguished from the premises, stand at more than £95,000,000 in the books of those companies and others who own the premises cannot be ascertained, but certainly the large discount at which the prices of brewery stocks and shares are quoted on the Stock Exchange shows that the market value of these licences, taking them as a whole, is far less than the amount at which they stand among the assets of brewery companies, and probably considerably short of £95,000,000.

Another point upon which information is meagre is the extent to which these licence values have already been written down or had

reserve funds accumulated against them. Clearly they ought to have been written down very freely. They are a very precarious and flimsy security, and the most elementary commercial prudence dictates that either that should be done steadily year by year or ample reserve funds should be accumulated. If directors have distributed as dividends profits which should have built up reserve funds, they have been rash and negligent, and must not blame others if the absence of adequate reserve funds now necessitates curtailment of future dividends.

We will proceed with the investigation on the basis of £95,000,000 representing the full market value of the "on" licences. During the time limit there is to be a large reduction in the number of licensed houses, for which compensation will be paid. It may be assumed that the owners of these licensed premises will receive about £12,000,000 from that source, and that the amount of the "on" licence values remaining to be provided for at the end of the time limit will be £95,000,000 less £12,000,000, or £83,000,000. Towards this many brewery companies have provided substantial reserve funds. Others have already written these values down considerably. Certainly the amount which it will be necessary to provide by the end of the time limit, or shortly afterwards, in addition to the reserve funds and the amounts already written off, will not exceed £70,000,000, and may be nearer £60,000,000.

In order to provide this amount it will be necessary to set aside from now to the end of the time limit from £3,000,000 to £3,500,000 a year. Taking the trade as a whole this is a comparatively small and perfectly manageable sum. It is less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the total retail receipts of the liquor trade in England and Wales. It is from 3 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the retail price of the liquor sold in the "on" licensed houses. Every trade in the country has frequently to deal with far greater proportionate variations in cost and price than this. Brewers are exceptionally favourably situated for dealing with the position. The trade is in a limited number of hands, and the retail trade is a monopoly. New outside competitors cannot step in. They cannot get a licence.

Further, while the reduction in the number of houses will diminish drinking, there will still be a considerable sale of drink transferred from the closed houses to the survivors. The gross profit on that additional trade will almost be net. The additional working cost to the surviving houses of doing so much of the trade as goes to them from the closed houses will be exceedingly small, practically *nil*. The population will also increase. By the end of the time limit the population of the country will be from one-fifth to one-sixth larger than it is now. A much reduced number of public-houses in a larger population means increased profit. I estimate that the surviving houses during the time limit will make a sufficient

additional profit, as the result of the disappearance of competitors and the growth of population, to provide something like half the total amount that it will be necessary for them to put aside to enable them to write off the licence values at the end of the time limit.

Of course these calculations are broad and general. They are based on the trade as a whole, and represent an average. But the financial position of brewery companies varies much. Some are strong and sound, and can face the proposals of the Bill with absolute equanimity. Others are in liquidation, and between these are a number of all shades and grades of prosperity and strength and lack of them. During the last quarter of a century this trade has experienced a period of extraordinary and reckless inflation and company promotion. After the *Over-Darwen* and *Sharp v. Wakefield* cases had, as Mr. Thomas Nash warned his clients, in the *Morning Advertiser*, the organ of the liquor trade, in September, 1883:—

“promulgated and divulged what had hitherto been, more or less, a professional secret, viz., that, subject to appeal, the licensing magistrates can refuse to renew the licence of any and every holder of an ‘on’ licence,”

there was an enormous rush to promote brewery companies and get the money of the public into them. Nearly every brewery company now in existence in England and Wales was registered after 1882, that is, after “the professional secret” had been “promulgated and divulged.” The public put scores of millions in, and those who sold and promoted many of the companies took tens of millions out. Public-houses were bought in the most reckless fashion. With the money obtained from the public, licensed premises were competed for most keenly, and the prices paid were run up to extravagant figures. When the so-called “values” had been thus inflated, many old-established concerns had their public-houses re-valued. On those valuations some of them issued debentures and preference shares, and with the proceeds purchased more houses at the exorbitant prices then current. All this wild finance, based on a speculation in annual licences and the good-will of public-houses, became a gigantic bubble which every new flotation inflated to larger dimensions. Brewers, company promoters, stock brokers and the public lost their heads. During the last eight or ten years there has been the inevitable reaction. Most of those who rushed in when the boom was at its height have been losing money ever since. Year by year they have seen the market prices of their investments dwindling away. Tens of millions have been lost and can never be recovered. They went in a mad gamble. There is a disposition in some quarters to transfer the blame for the fall in the prices of brewery securities to the present Government and

the Licensing Bill. But this is a futile effort to divert attention from the quarters where the responsibility really rests. The greater part of the depreciation in the value of brewery securities took place before the present Government was formed; and almost the whole, if not indeed the whole, of the further fall, which has been experienced since December, 1905, has merely been a continuation of the great depreciation which occurred before that date, accentuated possibly by the strong light which has recently been thrown upon the methods of brewery finance.

When the financial aspects of the Licensing Bill are being examined we can only consider the normal, reasonable, present value of licences. No attention can be paid to, and no reasonable person will expect provision to be made for, the abnormal and inflated prices which were paid years ago. That those prices were ridiculous was well known at the time.

It is now eleven years since the *Country Brewers' Gazette* said: "If public-house property is purchased at three or four times its intrinsic worth, the value of a brewery company's assets is considerably diminished." The amount at which licensed properties stand in brewery companies' or private owners' books, unless they have been severely written down since they were bought, is no criterion whatever of their present value. Many brewery companies are in such a deplorable financial condition, as the result of inexcusable inflation and over-capitalisation and the purchase of licensed premises at absurd prices,—combined in some cases with most imprudent dividend distributions in good times, when reserve funds should have been built up against the inevitable re-action and depreciation which they now have to face,—that there is nothing before them but drastic financial reconstruction. This is simply the nemesis of past imprudence. Licensing Bill or no Licensing Bill, many of them have to face the fact that they are not solvent. No amendment of the Licensing Bill can save them. That Bill is not responsible for their troubles and it cannot extract them from them.

There were flotations and flotations; and there are brewery companies and brewery companies. As has been indicated, there are some which are sound and strong and have been prudently managed. There are others which are weak and have been unwisely managed. Between these two groups there are many more.

I have had a large number of brewery balance sheets analysed by a well-known firm of London accountants. They have been arranged in groups.* In the first group there are 36 companies. The summary of their position works out thus:—

* I have published some of these particulars elsewhere; but the figures given here cover a larger number of companies.

TOTAL CAPITAL		Amount and Allocation of Net Profit.	Per Cent.
	£	£	
Debentures	9,357,017	392,604	4.19
Preference Shares	5,610,210	309,870	5.52
Ordinary Shares	6,467,600	842,989	13.03
Mortgages, Loans, De- posits, etc., ...	2,105,765	say 94,760	4.50
		1,640,223	
To Reserves	—	384,306	—
„ Sundry Funds, extra carry forward, etc. ...	—	26,702	—
Total	£23,540,602	£2,051,231	8.71
Total value of breweries, goodwill, licensed premises, and mortgages and loans lent by the companies			
			£26,481,005
Total amount of Reserve Funds			£5,061,603

The £26,481,005, which represents the value of the breweries, goodwill, licensed premises, loans, etc., includes in many cases plant, machinery and stock. After looking into the matter with care, I have arrived at the conclusion that it will be a fair estimate to assume that the monopoly licence values alone, exclusive of the premises, stand for half that amount, say £13,250,000. From this sum we must deduct the amounts which would be received by these companies as compensation for licences not renewed during the compensation period. That may be put down at £1,500,000, which would leave £11,750,000 as the amount of the licence values which these companies would have to provide at the end of the time limit.

The amount put aside for reserve funds last year by these companies was £384,306; and as that is about the average sum which they have put aside annually over a considerable period it may be assumed that it is quite a manageable figure for the future.

As the proposed time limit of fourteen years, which is to commence in April, 1909, would expire in 1923, that is sixteen years after the period covered by these balance sheets. If the same amount of £384,306 be put aside during each of these sixteen years, and be accumulated at 4 per cent, the total reserve funds will stand as follows at the end of the time limit:—

Present Reserve Funds	£5,061,603
£384,306 per annum accumulated for 16 years at 4 per cent.	8,387,094
	£13,448,697

It is clear, therefore, that the £11,750,000, which we have seen would be required, could be provided by these companies with the greatest ease, without calling upon them to do anything more during the time limit than they have been doing in the past, and without trenching upon the average dividends which they paid on their ordinary shares last year—the very handsome average of 13 per cent.

No account has been taken in these calculations of the additional profit which the surviving houses of these companies will make on the increased trade which they will do as the result of some portion of the business now done in the houses which will lose their licences going to them; and as the result of the growth of population. I have already expressed the opinion that nearly one-half of the amount required to write off the licence values will be forthcoming from this source alone.

The companies whose figures have just been dealt with are sound, well-managed, prudently financed, ordinary brewery companies in different parts of England and Wales, with a large number of licensed premises attached to them. They do not include such special concerns as Guinness's or Bass's. Either of those would come out of such an examination even more favourably than these 36 companies have done. It is submitted that the particulars which have now been given demonstrate beyond question that brewery companies whose capital is reasonable in amount, and which have steadily accumulated adequate reserve funds, can face the proposals of the Licensing Bill with perfect equanimity. All talk of ruin in their case is simply ridiculous.

A second group of 36 other companies, whose balance sheets have been investigated, represents a class of concerns whose position is good, but not so strong and sound as those which are comprised in the group with which we have just dealt. In the second group the capital is somewhat larger in proportion to the profits, and the amounts which have been accumulated as reserve funds are smaller. The summary of their position stands thus:—

TOTAL CAPITAL		Amount and Allocation of Net Profit.	Per Cent.
	£	£	
Debentures	6,100,160	258,410	4.24
Preference Shares	3,567,800	196,511	5.51
Ordinary Shares	3,876,720	399,256	10.30
Mortgages, Loans, Deposits, etc.	1,214,347	54,646	4.50
		908,823	
To Reserves	—	102,018	—
„ Sundry Funds, extra carry forward, etc.	—	39,064	—
Total	£14,759,027	£1,049,905	7.11

Total value of breweries, goodwill, licensed premises and mortgages and loans lent by the companies ...	£15,088,400
Total amount of Reserve Funds	£1,498,796

Proceeding as before, and taking half the value of the breweries, licensed premises, goodwill, loans, etc., as being represented by the licences alone as distinguished from the premises, we get, say, £7,550,000 as the amount of the licence values. If we deduct from this the sum of £800,000 as the amount which these companies are likely to receive as compensation for licences not renewed during the reduction period, we get £6,750,000 as the amount that will be required to write off the licence values in 1923.

The amount put aside for Reserve last year was £102,018. If this be done each year for the 16 years from 1907, and accumulated at 4 per cent, the total reserve funds at the end of the time limit will stand thus:—

Present Reserve Funds	£1,498,796
£102,018 per annum for 16 years at 4 per cent.	2,226,440
	£3,725,236

This is about £3,000,000 short of the amount that will be required to write off the licence values in 1923. These companies have distributed their profits as dividends too freely, and have not provided adequate reserve funds. They can make up for it now, and put themselves in a strong position if during the time limit they will be content with an average dividend of 6 per cent. on their ordinary shares in years such as 1907 was. That would enable them, as a group, to put aside annually during the time limit a further sum of £166,654. The position would then stand thus:—

Present Reserve Fund	£1,498,796
£102,018 per annum for 16 years at 4 per cent.	2,226,440
£166,654 per annum for 16 years at 4 per cent.	3,637,056
	£7,362,292

Here, again, it is clear that the amount required—£6,750,000—can be provided with comparative ease, and without any suggestion of the “ruin” which is so wildly talked about. As before, no account has been taken of the additional profits that will result from the disappearance of competing houses and the growth of population.

Further, in both cases the calculations are based on the supposition that the amounts set aside from now for reserves will accumulate

at 4 per cent. But brewers can use money to advantage at 5 per cent., and an increase of 1 per cent. in the rate of interest on the accumulating fund would make a substantial addition to the total amount at the end of the period. Lastly, 1907 was by no means a good year for the brewery and public-house trades. Consequently these calculations are based on the conditions actually prevailing in times which, for this trade, were certainly not booming or even good. In favourable years what is now foreshadowed could be done with much greater ease than is here suggested.

The third group, which has been tabulated from the "Stock Exchange Official Intelligence," consists of 61 companies which have been far less successful than those at which we have been looking. Many of them have been imprudently managed, and most of them are over-capitalised, some of them to an absurd extent.

1.—Four of them, with a total capital of £1,989,972, are in liquidation.

2.—Thirty-three have failed to pay the dividend on all or some portion of their preference shares. None of them paid any dividend on their ordinary shares last year, and most of them have failed to pay any ordinary dividends for several years. Their capital is £26,555,443. The amount of their reserve funds is given as £531,992, but 13 of them do not appear to have any reserve fund. It is clear that some drastic writing down of capital and financial reconstruction is needed here. A considerable proportion of this capital has gone. It has been lost and is irretrievable.

3.—Twenty-four others paid no dividend on their ordinary shares last year; and the majority of them failed to pay one in previous years. Their capital is £14,259,377. The amount of their reserve funds is given as £910,610, and several of them appear to have either no reserve fund at all or only a purely nominal one. Here, again, it is obvious that a considerable amount of writing down and reconstruction is required.

4.—Nineteen others paid small dividends on their ordinary shares, ranging from 1 to 3 per cent. Their capital is £26,936,974. The amount of their reserve funds is £607,257. Such small dividends as these are altogether inadequate for so speculative an investment as the ordinary shares of brewery companies. The reserve funds are, for the most part, paltry in the extreme, and it is quite clear that with such an inadequate provision the majority of these companies ought not to have paid any dividend on their ordinary shares.

When persons write to the newspapers, and, without mentioning the name of the company, give "an actual case" in which they allege that great loss will ensue if the Licensing Bill be passed, it will be found that, almost invariably, the "illustration" is taken from a company which is in one of the sections of the group now under consideration, where it is clear that a very large amount

of the nominal capital has already been lost, that altogether apart from anything that may or may not result from the Licensing Bill, there is great need for a severe use of the valuer's surgical knife, and the investors must write off much of their "securities" as worthless. They are victims of the brewery boom of years ago.

This investigation brings into great prominence the fact that moderate capitalisation, sound finance, good reserves and substantial dividends have gone together. Those concerns which are weakest and most need ample reserve funds are precisely those which have distributed in dividends nearly all their profits, and made the least provision for times of stress and difficulty.

The particulars which have been given are by no means exhaustive. They are only examples; but they cover £108,000,000 of capital. There are a large number of other companies which fall between groups two and three. There are some which might be placed in groups one and two. There are 150 companies, with a capital of £50,000,000, which do not issue complete accounts in an available form. It should also be observed that some companies have from time to time written down the book value of their licensed premises more or less freely. Consequently, although their reserve funds are small their financial position may be good. Their position is better than it appears on the surface to be.

What is claimed is that it has been shown that for sound and solvent companies the readjustment of their finances, which the Licensing Bill will necessitate, is quite feasible during the time limit which is proposed. They will only be compelled to do in the future what the best of them have done voluntarily in the past, and what ordinary commercial prudence should have required all of them to do. When they have done it they will be in a sounder position than ever, because they will have got rid of the incubus of an inflated and precarious item in their assets. The weaker concerns—many of which have been over-capitalised and imprudently managed and are already in more or less financial difficulty—may be compelled to face the realities of their position sooner than they otherwise would have done. During the discussions to which this will give rise, there may be some outspoken apportionments of blame and responsibility, which vendors, promoters and directors would gladly avoid or postpone; but the results can only be conducive to healthy and sound finance. For the troubles of these concerns neither the Government nor the Licensing Bill is responsible, and no reasonable man will suggest that Parliament should be deterred from pressing on with an urgently needed measure of social and moral reform because some people have invested unwisely, and those who were responsible for the control of the undertakings have failed to take elementary precautions for protecting their interests. All that can be asked is that a difficult situation shall

be handled as tenderly as is consistent with due regard for the paramount requirements of public well-being; and it is claimed that the proposals of the Bill do deal with that phase of the problem effectively and generously.

THOS. P. WHITTAKER.

COMMON-SENSE ABOUT BREWING AND THE BILL.

“THAT Accursed Drink.” There are times when in the distress and bitterness of man’s soul he finds a sort of refuge in utter misery, and a half longing to curse God and die. Sometimes it is his own trouble that brings him to this pass, sometimes the suffering of others, sometimes it is a contemplation of all the wretchedness in what might be a world full of brightness and beauty;—sometimes, on the other hand, it is little more than a temporary fit of indigestion. Whatever be the cause, the result is painful. It is hardly for us to judge whether the feeling be a sin or only a weakness, but no one can suppose it to be a healthy or desirable state. So neither is it right to utter the phrase at the head of this article, and to blaspheme against the produce of the earth. For all meat and drink comes from the soil, all is a product of light and air, and everything in itself is good, so it be put to a proper use.

There is no vice in the plants; and it is a bitter spirit which sees in them nothing but the instruments of man’s abuse. Unhappy is your state if, on passing through the hop-fields of Kent, you can do no better than curse the graceful things, on account of the uses to which they are put. In such a spirit you can feel indignant and rebellious in places where the valleys stand so thick with corn that they laugh and sing; for you will remember that some of the corn is barley, and will be converted into malt. Even the grapes, that in Southern Europe seem to embody so much sunshine and joy, yielding the wine that makes man of a cheerful countenance and refreshes him after a day’s toil,—even these can be condemned as conducing to evil.

But it is a terrible pity thus to blacken the face of nature. No vice should be associated with the gathering of the kindly fruits of the earth, nor with the making from them of the fermented liquors which can be preserved till the due time comes when we may enjoy them: these things are serviceable to man. It is not

the drinks themselves that should be reprobated. Reprobation should be kept for the conditions which adulterate and render noxious the liquid, and for all the other conditions which tempt man to take more than is good for him. One of these conditions is said to be the mode of retailing to the multitude; whereby social intercourse and comradeship can only be obtained in places where custom requires the ordering of drink. But a more potent circumstance is the daily life, which is often so dreary and monotonous that forgetfulness is sought in a bewildering of the senses, through what then becomes a sort of drug, inasmuch as it is used not to refresh or invigorate but to blunt and stupefy. In so far as this is the case, the blame rests mainly on the conditions enshrouding the lower average of civilised humanity—the badness of the homes, the monotony, the apparent stupidity, of existence, the scarcity of harmless recreation, the lack of education and interest in life, the ugly depressing wilderness of mean streets, the unrelenting toil without hope or outlook beyond the present;—even the weekly wage, to be spent within the week, with no eye to the future, and yet with no security of tenure,—even this must have a demoralising influence, not perhaps so trivial as may at first sight appear.

It may be true that adults who *want* to drown their cares, and begot themselves, should be able to get what they want, unless they are so diseased that society thinks it safer to put them under restraint. Mere physical compulsion or prohibition is never an ideal condition: the reform of the soul is the only reform of permanent value. So long as the wish for excess or for any other vice exists, things are not healthy; and abstinence imposed by others can only be regarded as temporary medicinal treatment, not as a radical cure.

But no artificial inducement or temptation to excess should be permitted by society. Whatever may be said in favour of our present system of distribution of drink—the system, namely, of licensing private persons to retail it for their own profit, and so to thrive on the excess drinking of the community,—it will not be denied that there are a number of earnest people who think it has turned out ill, and who desire to reform it.

Let us suppose for a moment that people who urge reform are partly right, and that the system of retailing is bad; or that there are too many retailers, too much active competition, and some high-pressure due to exorbitant rent. Let us assume any of these details, without at present going into the question of whether particular allegations are true, or whether any of the practical changes suggested would do anything to mitigate the evil. Let us assume merely that all is not well with our public-house system—that there are some evils connected with it which demand treatment and mitigation and reform. And then let us go on to ask in what way does reform of the conditions of sale affect the producer of the drink? How does

it affect the hop-growers and the brewers? Does it interfere with their industry and manufacture? Does it prevent brewers from still producing good wholesome beverage, and supplying it to the retailers? Need a change in the system of retailing hurt them?

All that it can do is to alter the amount consumed: it may diminish the consumption. But surely they agree that at present too much is consumed. They cannot really wish for national drunkenness. They would not desire to thrive on a National vice. No, I am sure they would indignantly repudiate the suggestion and forcibly rebut any such accusation.

Very well, then, they can go on making their drink better and wholesomer than ever before. There is room for improvement, except, perhaps, in the highest qualities. We have not got a cheap average liquor in this country equal to the German beer. What can be more refreshing, after a long day's tramp, than a good draught of way-side Lager? Sound healthy stuff,—so plenty of exercise be taken. Yes, there is still something to be learnt about brewing; and some Universities study it, and teach the principles which underlie it—the principles of malting and fermentation, and all the other scientific details. One, at least, even in this country, is, to my knowledge, doing so.

A capital thing! Baking, and brewing, and cooking, and cleansing, and all the ancient homely human arts, should surely be studied scientifically, be practised intelligently, and be done as well as possible. Let us take the fruits of the earth, and make the most of them; let us wrench them away from destruction and devil-worship, and use them to glorify the Giver of all good things. Bread and wine,—are they not things of sacramental efficacy? How dare any man curse either of them—unless he is himself so crazed with the misery and degradation he sees around him that he may perhaps be excused. •

But, it is urged, the conditions of retailing are bad, and must be changed. By all means; there is nothing divine about *them*. They were devised by society, and by society they can be changed. Who shall object to reasonable reform? The retailers? Yes, they may; they may think their trade will be ruined, they will ask for timely notice, that they may turn their attention to other things,—may aim at becoming purveyors of food also, and of other kinds of drink; may enter, perhaps, in some cases, another kind of trade.

Even with time to look round, the change may fall a little hard on them. True; but if they can realise that it is in the interest of the nation they will acquiesce. It is a little hard on a man in the Reserves, sometimes, after he has settled down to a peaceful home industry, to be called out and sent to a seat of war. But it is for the good of the nation—or so he hopes,—and he acquiesces. It is hard sometimes, so we may presume, when a coal-pit accident calls

for volunteers to risk their lives to descend into foul atmosphere and encounter heart-rending sights. The demands of the community are often more than a little hard upon individuals; but individuals nevertheless rise to the occasion, and are honoured, and it may be blessed, accordingly.

People do not cry out when called upon for sacrifice for the national good; a spirit of emulation arises. And even though the accident or the fire has been the result of criminal carelessness, even though the war is a mistaken and unjust war,—yet their country has entered upon it, they do not stop to reason why,—they obey orders and they do their duty.

And in the present instance I do not accuse the retailers of complaining, if notice is given that their annually renewed licence may cease to be renewed after a certain date. We do not hear so much outcry from them; we hear it from, or on behalf of, the strangest people—widows, and clergy, and people who, one would have supposed, were quite independent of licences for the sale of drink. We hear it also from brewers and producers of liquor, but especially from shareholders, who, being numerous, can accentuate the clamour. But what have all these got to do with it? Can it be that some of the great brewery companies have become retailers as well as producers? Is it true that, in order to press the sale of their own liquors, in a competitive rush for a supply exceeding the demand, they have invented a system of tied houses, and, in a spasm of recklessness about ten years ago, have acquired property at an inflated and artificial value,—inflated in some cases by the very wretchedness of the slums in which they over-numerously exist?

Something of the kind seems to have happened: experts know better than I about the details; I am only now dealing with a matter of common-sense. Altering the system of licensing, and curbing the retailers, ought not to injure the brewers in their proper avocation.

If, for the sake of extra profits, some of them have stepped out of their province, have made themselves responsible for retailing as well, and have regarded public-house licences as part of their assets,—well, they must stand the racket of what may have been wisdom in the past, and may turn out unwisdom in the future. It was a speculation—not quite legitimate perhaps, though doubtless perfectly legal—and it may succeed or it may fail.

But as to the shareholders who take no part in the enterprise, who contribute not an iota of knowledge or interest to the production of any beverage or anything else,—who lend cash only in the hope of profits, through a manufacture of which they know nothing,—what is their standing? It is to be supposed that they invest hoping for big dividends and rising prices. Sometimes they get what they hope for, sometimes they get the opposite. But

surely they can take the rough with the smooth. Even Consols have gone down of late years, and a multitude of the simplest and mildest class of investors must have been hurt; but we do not hear much outcry from them. Losses are painful, no doubt; but it usually happens that on the average the gains fairly balance them.

Wherever large profits are offered, it is usually understood that there is some compensating risk. Why do brewery shareholders make an outcry such as we do not hear from other shareholders when their property drops in nominal value? Their real and legitimate property is untouched; their buildings and their factories—so far as they are theirs—remain as before. Production can go on just as well,—better perhaps; improved and light quality might extend the area of legitimate consumption, without any approach to individual excess.

Meanwhile their shares have dropped: have been dropping indeed for some little time, irrespective of present proposals. Very good; let them suffer in silence, and not expose themselves to the suspicion of being actuated solely by the spirit of greed, without any regard to the welfare of the community. The Spirit of Greed is the Modern Devil, and it is one of the devil's recognised functions to oppose every beneficent change.

Whether the change proposed by the present Government is beneficent or not is a proposition that can be argued on its merits, but I confess that the opposition and outcry from vested interests makes me suspect that it is. If so, I trust that there will be plenty of power to proceed in spite of outcries.

But, although it is essential that the community shall be at liberty to manage its own affairs, interference with any legitimate trade or manufacture is always to be deprecated, unless really necessary, and should only be undertaken with due circumspection and consideration. So if it can be shown that the Government proposals are deleterious to the community, if it is really believed that the present system is righteous and beneficent—blessing both him that sells and him that drinks—then by all means let the clamour become intelligent, let it display the subtle poison lurking in the proposals, and put them to an open shame.

OLIVER LODGE.

THE NECESSARY BASIS OF SOCIETY.*

I N choosing for the subject of my presidential address "The Necessary Basis of Society," I shall not, I hope, be thought to have infringed the rule of the Social and Political Education League, which excludes the partisan treatment of controversies of current politics. I shall not deal with any plank of the platform of the Liberal, the Conservative, or the Labour Party. Nor is it my intention to argue the more fashionable thesis of to-day, that either Socialism or Individualism, according to taste, is the more desirable principle on which to organise society. It is, however, important to remember that, whilst all questions directly bearing on theology are expressly excluded, it is the special business of the League to educate England in politics. There can, therefore, be no question of the exclusion from its lectures of subjects of political or economic controversy. Nor can it discharge its duty by avoiding the topics on which controversy is hot. To discuss nothing but dead issues is not the way to educate people in live ones. I regret to see some signs of a tendency to an increase in the proportion of lectures dealing with safe and non-controversial subjects, and a discreet avoidance of the living topics of social and political discussion. It is the manner and the tone of the lecture, the quality of the information supplied, and the intellectual method in which the subject is handled, that are important, not the controversial nature of the topic. A Social and Political Education League that avoided all subjects about which other people were showing themselves partisans would, in my judgment, be fit for nothing but the silent and obscure burial that it would inevitably receive.

Having made that protest in my capacity as President for the year, I hasten to reassure any timid person in my audience that the subject of the present discourse is not one that involves any partisan controversy at all. My aim is the more limited and, I venture to hope,

* An Address to the Social and Political Education League, 14th May, 1908.

the more practically useful one of bringing to the notice of the League certain considerations on which all political parties can agree; considerations without attention to which, I believe, it is impossible to expect to have, on any principles whatsoever, even a decently successful social order. However much the rival partisans may quarrel among themselves as to what sort of social order they wish to have—however much in this respect the Liberal may differ from the Conservative, the Republican from the Royalist, the Democrat from the Aristocrat, the Trade Unionist from the Capitalist, the Socialist from the Individualist—there are, as I venture to believe, certain fundamental matters of social organisation which they can (and, if they are well-informed reasonable beings, must) accept as indispensable to any successful carrying out of their own projects and ideas.

I invite you, in the first place, to consider for a moment some of the characteristics of popular government. It has been, in a sense, the special task of the nineteenth century, in our conceptions of social organisation, to bring into prominence the claims, and needs, and rights of the average man, the typical citizen, the normal human being. I do not need to expatiate on the triumphant progress round the world of what we may call the ideas of 1789; on the rout and extermination of the notion that society ought or can even properly be governed for the advantage of a privileged class; or on the universal acceptance of the Democratic assumption that it is by its results upon the life of the whole body of citizens that every Government must stand or fall. One effect of this triumph of Democracy has been to influence us all in favour of large and sweeping applications of governmental administration. That which is used or enjoyed or participated in by every citizen alike has necessarily come to seem much more "Democratic" than that which can only be used or enjoyed or participated in by a few people. Seeing that all have to pay for governmental action, we get into the habit of thinking it exceptionally appropriate—even, we may say, specially fair—to employ the forces of government in such ways only, and for such ends only, as concern us all. So much is this the case that there are actually people to-day, thinking themselves educated, who make this a test of legislation. If a measure does not extend to the whole population they denounce it as "class legislation," the implication being that "class legislation" is bad, or wicked, or, at any rate, undemocratic. It is characteristic of the infantile condition of American political thought that in some of the United States class legislation is actually forbidden by the State Constitution. The result of this conception has been that the work of government, so far as it has been based on Democratic ideas, has so far reminded us rather of the crude and clumsy proceedings of an army of occupation than of any fine adjustment of services to needs. It has, even in the most advanced countries, progressed little further—to use a pregnant

phrase of Mr. H. G. Wells—than dealing with things in a wholesale sort of way. But the wholesale method of supplying human needs is very far from ensuring accurate adjustment. We are apt to forget that the average citizen or the normal human being is a mere abstraction, and simply does not exist. You and I have never seen him in the flesh. So varied is our individuality that whatever is handed out to all alike must necessarily fail to meet our requirements with any exactness. This is not a valid objection to nineteenth-century achievements. A regiment of naked men needs clothing too urgently to allow us to grumble that the standard sizes of the regimental contractor make all the uniforms, if closely scrutinised, nothing better than misfits. The Early Victorian community, bare of schools, or drains, or Factory Acts, had to get itself supplied with the common article of standard pattern, so to speak, by wholesale, in order to be able to survive at all. But this necessity ought not to blind us to the fact that, when we come to scrutinise them closely, all these governmental products, supplied on the conception of Democracy as necessarily a wholesale provider, are, one and all, like the army contractors' uniforms, nothing better than misfits.

My first proposition is, therefore, the paradoxical one that, whilst it may have been the most pressing business of nineteenth-century governments to deal with the whole people, or, at any rate, with majorities, by far the most important business of twentieth-century governments must be to provide not only for minorities, but even for quite small minorities, and actually for individuals. We are no longer content with the army contractors' standard sizes. The regimental boots and uniforms have got to be made to fit each individual soldier. This, when you come to think of it, is just as "Democratic," in any sense whatsoever, as the merely wholesale method. "Class legislation," in short, is not only not bad, or wicked, or undemocratic, but actually the only good, the only useful, and the only really effective legislation. Of course, it is not necessary to confine legislative advantages to one minority any more than to one individual. Every minority—every citizen, in fact—has to be supplied, under the one system as under the other, just as every soldier in the regiment has to have his suit of clothing and his pair of marching boots. Only, on the one method, the fit is so bad that the soldier is galled, and his marching and fighting capacity falls far short of what can be attained. On the other method, an improved fit so much increases freedom of action that both comfort and efficiency are greatly increased.

An actual example of progressive government action may serve to make my meaning clearer. A century ago the provision of schools formed in England no part of governmental activity. The first need was to get supplied in sufficient quantity the most universal and least specialised type of school. The Democratic programme was simply "schools for all." The ideal of advanced reformers was the

universal provision of the "common school," the school common to all, in which, in every group of a few hundred families, all the boys or girls—some said all the boys *and* girls—should sit side by side, receiving, whatever their intellects, whatever their idiosyncrasies, whatever their opportunities, the same kind and degree of education. We may agree that these enthusiastic Democrats were right in desiring to get rid of purely artificial class distinctions in education. Moreover, a lonely village, like the cluster of homesteads in the early American backwoods, has necessarily got to put up with a single undifferentiated school. But we do not to-day, in any highly organised community, provide, or expect to have provided, any monotonous array of such "common schools." We recognise now that children have infinitely varied needs and capacities in education. Where many thousands of children are together in the same locality, we have learnt how to avoid the more atrocious of the misfits that were involved in the "common school." And thus an Education Authority such as that of London already provides not one kind of school, but several dozen different kinds—not merely the ordinary boys' schools and girls' schools and infant schools, but also special schools for the quick and precocious, and special schools for the backward and feeble-minded; blind schools and deaf schools and cripple schools; day schools and boarding schools; truant schools and industrial schools; domestic economy schools and three or four kinds of trade schools; and half-a-dozen different types of secondary schools. The "schools for all," for which Bentham and James Mill and Francis Place strove a century ago, have become differentiated into these dozens of different kinds of school for differently situated groups of children. What was originally a common universal provision has become a highly specialised meeting of the needs of a series of minorities—many of them quite small minorities. And the end is not yet. We don't yet know how to provide each individual child with exactly the kind and grade and amount of education that its individuality requires. This, however, and not "common schools," has already become, in education, the Democratic ideal.

Or consider, in another sphere of government, how far we have already travelled in a quite analogous differentiation and specialisation of Poor Relief. Originally the dominant conception of the Poor Law was the relief of destitution, visualised as the handing out of bread or other necessities of life, just to keep people from dying of starvation. Nowadays we do not think of dealing with our million of paupers in any such simple and uniform way. When you come to think of it, there is no average pauper, any more than there is an average man. Hence the very notion of the simple undifferentiated "relief" of the destitute—the very conception of herding them all together in one common institution—is to-day quite comically obsolete, though we still find dear, good people, who really date back

to before 1834, unable to imagine anything else, and still discussing little details about the horribly demoralising mixed general workhouse, as if it were not a scandal and a disgrace to us that this dreadful building, unknown in any other country, has not long ago been razed to the ground. What the modern enlightened Poor Law administrator has learnt is that there is no category of the destitute; that the people with whom he has to deal do not, in fact, form a single class at all, but a whole series of distinct classes, differing widely in their requirements. Thus, what we aim at providing to-day is not relief at all, but appropriate treatment for each class—foster parents or nurseries for such of the destitute persons as are infants, schools for such of them as are children, specialised infirmaries for such of them as are sick, highly equipped asylums for such of them as are of unsound mind, suitable homes for such of them as are merely aged, farm colonies or training homes for the able-bodied for whom work cannot be found, and dozens of more minutely specialised forms of treatment appropriate to such sub-classes as the blind, the deaf, the crippled, the candidates for migration or emigration, the feeble-minded, the sane epileptics, the chronic inebriates, and so on. It is really ludicrous to think that, in this twentieth century, we still expect all these different services, each requiring its own specialised technique, to be administered in each locality by a single body, the Board of Guardians, which can thus never possess either the knowledge or the competent staff to deal properly with any one of them. The survival down to the present day of such an anomalous authority as the Board of Guardians, with such an entirely obsolete institution as the mixed general workhouse, established to deal in an undifferentiated way with such an unreal abstraction as "the destitute," is a striking example of how imperfectly we have yet realised that Government action of this "universal" character is entirely out of date.

From my fundamental paradox that governmental action, to be successful, must henceforth necessarily take the form, more and more, of provision for minorities, various inferences follow. We see at once how needful becomes, in every branch of administration and legislation, a high degree of specialised knowledge and expertness. The provision for the average man, whether in the way of prohibitions or in matters of supply, is a comparatively simple matter. The draughtsmen of the American Constitution and the authors of the "Rights of Man," writing as they did for the Political Man—quite as unreal a being as the Economic Man—found no difficulty in deducing from first principles all the government that they contemplated. I sometimes think that those who object to any other kind of legislation are often unconsciously biassed by a haunting suspicion that they, at any rate, are unequipped for it. In our own time it does not require much knowledge to draw up, let us say, a Factory Law on the lines of universal application still customary in the legislation of

France. Clause 1: The hours of labour shall not exceed eight per day. Clause 2: The Minister of the Interior is charged with the execution of this law. This is really no exaggeration of the type of legislation to which the conception of governmental action as concerned with the whole people inevitably leads. What we in England have learnt is that not until factory legislation has been broken up and sub-divided into highly specialised regulations, each affecting a particular trade or a group of trades—in short, not until government becomes a matter of dealing with minorities—becomes, in fact, nothing but “class legislation”—does it become either effective in itself or other than a clanking fetter and incumbrance upon our personal freedom. But well-fitting clothes involve skilled tailoring. Accordingly legislation and governmental administration necessarily become, in all highly-organised communities—however Democratic they may be—more and more the business of elaborately trained experts, and less and less the immediate outcome of popular feeling. Nothing was more inexact than the forecast that so alarmed our fathers, that Democracy meant government by the mob. The more strong and effective becomes the Democratic feeling, the more will legislatures and governments be driven to grapple seriously with the real grievances and needs, not of the people in the abstract, but of the people as they really are; the more will it become clear that the only way to do this is to provide what is actually required by the series of small minorities of which the people as a whole is composed; and the more this continuous series of class legislation, dealing successively with every class in the community, will necessarily involve, not the sweeping generalities and political abstractions which mark to-day the political thinking both of mobs and college common-rooms, nor even the comparatively simple, broad general issues that can be submitted to direct popular vote, or formulated by the merely amateur member of Parliament, but the highly-elaborated technicalities characteristic of the really experienced departmental administrator. Already we come to recognise that it is neither the street corner orator nor the Fellow of All Souls who makes the most successful member of a twentieth-century Cabinet.

But this inference is not the one on which I wish here to lay most stress. Nor do I wish to do more than glance in passing at another consequence of government more and more concerning itself with minorities. It is almost impossible to get out of the heads of fastidious people of the last generation a shrinking terror of Democracy as involving the sacrifice of all that is delicate, all that is refined, all that is distinguished, to the needs and passions of the “vulgar herd.” But the “vulgar herd” is, as we have now seen, no indissoluble whole, necessarily swamping any small minority. It is, in itself, nothing but a congeries of small minorities—each of them by itself quite as weak and powerless politically as the “remnant” of

refined and distinguished folk, which may therefore quite comfortably reassure its timid soul. The most Democratic government of the ensuing century—based, as it must necessarily be, on the very idea of providing for each of the series of minorities of which the world is made up—is as likely to provide for one minority as for another, for its poets as for its apprentices, for its scientists as for its soldiers, for its artists as for its artificers, and with the advance of actual knowledge in the administration is even more likely to know how they can be fostered and really well provided for than the irresponsible plutocratic patron ever did.

And here I come at last to the proposition which I am more particularly concerned to press upon you to-night. As it is coming more and more to be the business of government to deal with minorities, to provide what is required for minorities, to legislate for minorities, because minorities are what the people as a whole is composed of, so we are discovering, in one department of life after another, that it is upon the specialised scientific treatment of minorities—often of quite small minorities—that social well-being depends. It is not enough to provide the government that we might imagine would be required for a community of average, normal, healthy citizens—that way, in the actual world in which we live, made up as it is entirely of citizens who are not average or normal at all, lie degeneration, disease and death. Consider first the case of physical health. If the community provides no exceptional provision for the sick—no special care of the tuberculous, no isolation hospitals for zymotic diseases, none of the social elaborations of modern preventive medicine—we know that disease will arise, and will spread, not to the wealthy alone but also to the strong; that not only will the yearly toll of death be heavier than it need be, but that sickness will drag down and incapacitate also the normal man, and abstract unnecessary days from social service; and, worse than all, even, if it do not affect adversely that mysterious germplasm on which the race depends, that it will, at any rate, generation after generation, impair the vitality and lower the efficiency of the community as a whole. Hence, every civilised government finds it imperative to provide elaborately for the quite small minority of the sick—to deal with them, in fact, individually, one by one—to insist on extensive precautions against disease; to press, indeed, upon everyone, so far as we yet know how, the obligation to be well—that is to say, to promulgate and enforce what may be called a National Minimum of Health, below which, in the interest of the community as a whole, no one is permitted to fall.

Carry the conception a stage further. The past century has seen a gradual and empirical adoption of the principle of the segregation of persons of unsound mind—of special provision by appropriate institutions for even harmless lunatics and idiots, for epileptics and chronic inebriates, now about to be extended to the merely feeble-minded—

partly, no doubt, out of humanity to the unfortunate individuals themselves, but more and more because of a recognition of the fact that their indiscriminate presence in the competitive world has a tendency to deteriorate the sane, to drag down the standard of intelligence and self-control, to lower the level of order as well as of intellect in the community as a whole. We now, in short, enforce a National Minimum of Sanity, below which no denizen of the world of free citizenship is allowed to fall.

And we have already gone much further. With the support—now unanimous, if somewhat belated—of the Economists, we have recognised that the conditions of the wage contract can no more safely be left uncontrolled by law than any other department of civilised life, and we have the constantly growing series of Factory Acts, Mines Regulation Acts, Merchant Shipping Acts, Shop Hours Acts, Railways Regulation Acts—all proceeding on the principle that it is absolutely necessary for social well-being that there should be an inflexible inferior limit below which the conditions of employment must not be permitted to fall.

And now at last the meaning of my title will, I hope, be clear. My thesis is that the necessary Basis of Society, in the complications of modern industrial civilisation, is the formulation and rigid enforcement in all spheres of social activity, of a National Minimum below which the individual, whether he likes it or not, cannot, in the interests of the well-being of the whole, ever be allowed to fall. It is this policy of a National Minimum which, in my judgment, is going to inspire and guide and explain the statesmanship and the politics of the twentieth century.

I have already described some of the ways in which this policy of a National Minimum has, usually without much comprehension of its bearing, influenced our social and industrial legislation. But it is clear that various other applications of the policy lie near at hand, to some of which we may, in conclusion, give our attention. In the Democratic politics of to-morrow we may expect to see the policy of the National Minimum translating itself into four main branches of legislative and executive activity. There will clearly have to be a legal minimum of wages, as there is already in Australasia. The employers will be under no legal obligation to employ any person whatsoever; but if they do employ him or her, it will be a condition of every contract, not to be waived or ignored, that its terms shall not be such as will impair the efficiency of the citizen or diminish the vitality of the race. To engage labour at wages insufficient to repair the waste of tissue caused by the employment is demonstrably to injure the community as a whole, and will be prosecuted as such in the criminal courts. Those whose labour, in the judgment of the employers, is not worth the National Minimum—the aged, the crippled, and the blind, the mentally or morally deficient, the epileptic and the

chronically feckless and feeble-minded—will be maintained by the community, as, indeed, they are now. But as every Economist knows, of all the ways of maintaining those unable to earn a full livelihood, by far the most costly and injurious is to allow them to compete in the labour market, and thus to drag down by their very infirmity those who are whole. There are still people, of course, who simply cannot imagine how a legal minimum wage could possibly be enforced, just as there were, sixty years ago, economists who demonstrated the impossibility of factory laws. I don't think we need waste time to-night over their ignorance—for it is simply ignorance.

There will be a National Minimum of Leisure and recreation secured by law to every wage earner. It will certainly be an implied condition of every contract of employment, rigidly enforced by law, that it shall leave untouched fourteen or sixteen hours out of each twenty-four for needful sleep, recreation, exercise of mind or body, and the duties of citizenship and family life. Any attempt by man or woman to sell for wages any part of the fourteen or sixteen sacred hours will be blamed as virtual embezzlement, since this part of the twenty-four hours' day must be regarded as necessarily reserved for the purpose of maintaining unimpaired the efficiency of the race. Any employer purchasing them, or allowing them to be spent in his mill or mine, will be prosecuted and punished, just as if he had incited to embezzlement or had received stolen goods. This, indeed, is already law, though very imperfectly, in our Factory Acts.

There will be a National Minimum of Sanitation, enforced not merely on land or house owners or occupiers, but also on local governing authorities. The nation will find it preposterous that any parish or city, merely out of stupidity, or incapacity, or parsimony, should foster disease, or bring up its quota of citizens in a condition of impaired vitality. The power of the community as a whole will, somehow or other, be brought to bear upon every backward district, compelling it to lay on pure water, to improve its drainage, and to take such action, even by municipal building, if need be, that no family in the land shall have less than "three rooms and a scullery" as the minimum required for health and decency. Along with this must come the adequate provision of medical attendance, skilled nursing, and hospital accommodation for all the sick. White infants, in particular, are getting too scarce to be allowed to die at their present quite unnecessary rate. Within a generation of the adoption of such a policy the death-rate and sickness experience would show a reduction of one-third of what is at present endured as if it were the decree of Providence.

There will obviously be a National Minimum of Education—not merely in the provision of schools, but in genuinely compulsory attendance at them. Besides schools and colleges of every grade, there will have to be an adequate "scholarship ladder," securing maintenance

as well as free tuition, right up to the post-graduate course, for every scholar proving himself or herself fitted for anything beyond ordinary schooling. And this provision will be enforced by the national power upon local school authorities, as well as upon parents and employers. What right has any part of the community to allow any part of its quota of citizens to be reared in ignorance, or to suffer even one potential genius to be lost to the community? The next few years will see not only a great improvement in ordinary schooling, but also the doubling or trebling of our expenditure on higher education.

The lesson of economic and political science to the twentieth century is that only by such highly differentiated governmental action for all the several minorities that make up the community—only by the enforcement of some such policy of a National Minimum in Subsistence, Leisure, Sanitation, and Education—will modern industrial communities escape degeneration and decay. Where life is abandoned to unfettered competition, what is known as "Gresham's Law" applies—the bad drives out the good. To prevent this evil result is, as both Europe and America are discovering in the twentieth century, the main function of government.

Now, I dare say that some of you, knowing that I am a Socialist, will imagine that they see in this proposition nothing but a cunningly-devised form of Socialism, put skilfully in a way not to shock—let us say the very distinguished statesman and administrator who has done the League and me the honour to take the chair to-night.* On my honour I have no such guile. In my view, this policy of the National Minimum is a necessary condition of a healthy social order, whether you adopt the Individualist or the Collectivist principle in the organisation of your State. You cannot have a successful and healthy Individualist State—whether of millionaires and wage slaves or of peasant proprietors and small masters—without it. In fact, it is the necessary *basis* of Society, whether you intend the *super-structure* to remain Individualist or whether you wish it to become Collectivist. You will notice that to enforce the National Minimum will not interfere either with the pecuniary profits or the power or the personal development of the exceptional man. The illimitable realm of the upward remains, without restriction, open to him. The policy of the National Minimum does not involve any attack upon, or any diminution of, either rent or interest—the whole differential advantage of superior sites, and soils, and machines, and opportunities remains absolutely unaffected. That, by the way, is why I, as a Socialist, describe it only as the basis of social organisation; it does not, like Socialism, deal with the superstructure. Nor does it abolish competition which, as we may confidently reassure timid Individualists, can no more be abolished than gravitation. But in the wild anarchy

* The Right Hon. Sir Alfred Lyall, K.C.B., G.C.I.E., D.C.L.

of unregulated modern industry, competition is apt to be as indiscriminately destructive as was the fall of the Tower of Siloam. It is, I need hardly remind you, quite a mistake to suppose that the bracing and invigorating action of competition, or any other social force, is proportionate to its intensity. We do not nowadays plunge our babies into cold water in order to harden them, or deliberately bring up our sons—whatever we may do with those of the poor—between a gin-shop and a brothel, in order to strengthen their characters. In the domain of human experience and social organisation generally, as I have read of biology, "Weak stimuli kindle life activity, medium "stimuli promote it; but strong stimuli impede it, and the strongest "bring it altogether to an end."* What the enforcement of a policy of the National Minimum does to competition, as we see by a whole century of experience of factory legislation, is to change its form and shift its incidence. By fencing off the downward way, we divert the forces of competition along the upward way. What generally happens is that we transfer the competitive pressure away from a degradation of the means of subsistence of the mass of the people (where it does little but harm), to the intellect of everyone who has any, in the degree that he has it (where it quite usefully sharpens the wits). Only by constructing this Necessary Basis can the twentieth century community go forward—only in this way, in fact, can it avert social degradation and decay.

SIDNEY WEBB.

* Rudolf Arndt.

OXFORD IN THE SIXTIES.

IF a man who had been at Oxford in the sixties were now to re-visit the place after a long absence, his first surprise would be at the number of young ladies he saw careering about on bicycles. He would suppose that this spectacle was a result of the women's colleges; but though Somerville and "Maggie Hall" contribute their share, most of the riders belong to the great suburb which has added itself to the city during the last forty years. The houses in the new quarter are mostly nice houses, and the people who inhabit them are doubtless nice people; yet it must be owned that this growth has made modern Oxford more commonplace than the Oxford of the past. Cambridge has been more fortunate in this respect, and better retains its old-world aspect.

It might be expected that the presence of so many ladies would make the men more careful in their dress. Strange to say, such has not been the case; and the change that would next startle our visitor would probably be the shabby and untidy appearance of many of the undergraduates. This amazed Mr. Gladstone on his last visit to Oxford. The explanation is to be found in the general pursuit of athletics. Men naturally go to the river or to the football field in easy and scanty clothing, and they are tempted to continue the practice in unsuitable places. There are colleges now in which men even come to hall clad in light coats, an offence for which in bygone days they would infallibly have been sconced by the head of their table. Some years ago the proctors perceived that this love of dishabille was increasing, and that before long men would find their way into the examination schools attired in flannels. So they issued an edict, requiring black coats to be worn in the schools. Great was the perplexity among the candidates, for many of them did not possess a black morning coat. There was only one way out of the difficulty. The next day the quads were dotted with curious figures

wearing evening dress coats at 9 a.m. After all, in this they resembled Jowett, who always wore a coat of this description throughout the day. In other respects than dress the undergraduate is the same cheery person that he was fifty years ago.

An old man is proverbially a *laudator temporis acti se puero*, but not many are such fine old Tories as were some of the Heads in the middle of last century. Wilson, the President of Trinity, was a fairly typical Head. His stiff courtesy carried you back into the age of Sir Charles Grandison, and so did his formal speech. If Mr. Green wrote a particularly good essay, his tutor would direct that he should read it to the President after morning chapel. Then the President would say: "Now, Mr. Green, will you be so good as to read your 'declamation'"; and when the essay was concluded he would add, with a dignified bow, "Thank you, Mr. Green. The sentiments are 'just, and the language well expressed.'" We did not see much of the President, except in chapel, where he read the service in a breathless sort of gabble, with the words tumbling over each other. He did not make the comical mistakes in enunciation which are attributed to a living Oxford Head, but he certainly, on more than one occasion, startled the congregation by reading out, "And they 'that have done evil shall go into life everlasting, and they that have 'done good into eternal fire." In his youth Dr. Wilson had been a reformer, but now all change was abhorrent to him. He had lost a hand through an accident in shooting, and accordingly sympathised with the college clock, which had never possessed more than one hand since the memory of man. A newly-elected fellow proposed that a minute hand should be added to the clock, and the mere suggestion nearly threw the old gentleman into a fit. The reforming zeal of younger men sorely tried him, and I once benefited by this feeling on his part. One fifth of November a festive out-college friend let off some fireworks out of my window. My rooms were opposite the President's abode, so the next day Dr. Wilson sent for me. Of course I admitted the offence, and then I continued: "And 'I much fear, sir, that one of the crackers fell on the head of the 'junior fellow." I cannot help thinking that this additional guilt softened the severity of the President's reprimand.

Wilson was succeeded by "Sammy Wayte." Some distinguished persons at Oxford appear mysteriously, like Melchisedek, as if they had neither kith nor kin. This was not the case with Wayte, who invited his father to Oxford, and brought him into hall and common-room. It was said that the "aged parent" used to forget that his son was no longer a boy, and, when the President made a remark, would interrupt him with "Sam, don't be a fool." I do not know whether this story is true, but I am sure that Wayte, with his kind heart, would have been as forbearing with the infirmities of age as he was with the follies of youth.

Of all the Heads at that time the most dignified was Liddell, whose stately presence and good sense well qualified him for his position as Dean of Christ Church. He was an exception to the general rule that schoolmasters make bad heads of colleges; Bullock-Marsham, of Merton, was the only layman at the head of a college. He had stood against Gladstone to represent the University, and was more like a cultivated country gentleman than a formal academic. Another college also had a Head who resembled a country gentleman, but in the latter case the country gentleman was Squire Western. There were legends how this person, who shall remain unnamed, had driven up to the college gates in a helpless condition, with his feet hanging out of the window of the fly. On one occasion the college over which he presided gave a ball, and in the course of the evening it became manifest that one of the musicians had taken too much to drink. The Head volunteered to remove the man, and an altercation arose between them, which speedily disclosed the fact that the Head was as tipsy as the fiddler.

There still survived here and there a few persons holding close fellowships who were equally unsuited for their position. It was, I think, in St. John's common-room that Stanley, on his return from Palestine, was speaking about Jerusalem, when he was interrupted by a person of this type with the ejaculation, "Jerusalem be d——d! "Don't you know that here we only talk of wine, women, and horses?" Of course this was utterly untrue of St. John's common-room, to which Mansel, the wittiest man in Oxford, belonged.

For wide reading and intellectual ability the most distinguished Head was Mark Pattison, whose queer and egotistic character stands revealed in his Memoirs. He had been an intimate disciple of Newman, and would have followed him to Rome, men said, if he had not missed the omnibus. In his Newmanite days he was severely ascetic, and was strongly suspected of having burnt the ancient common-room betting book, which, indeed, contained some rather scandalous entries. He also, when bursar, omitted to keep up the stock of port, so that for some time in later years there was only immature wine in the college cellar. As pro-proctor he showed himself most zealous in enforcing discipline. On one occasion he lay in wait for a tandem, but the men disregarded his summons to stop, and drove rapidly on. Pattison was not to be defeated. He took off his cap and threw it at the dogcart, and succeeded in knocking off the hat of one of the culprits, with the owner's name inscribed. It would have been more amusing if the tandem party had caught the proctorial cap, and carried it off in triumph.

Subsequently Pattison changed his religious opinions, but his egotism remained unaltered. The only difference was that instead of seeking to save his own soul, he now concerned himself with cultivating his own intellect. But his discontented, peevish face bore

witness to the truth that thinking only of self is not the way to happiness. I never met anyone whose judgment on the merits of a book I should respect so highly, always provided the author were a stranger to Pattison. But, if any personal feeling were involved, Pattison's opinion became valueless, and his expression of it unscrupulous. For instance, there was among the fellows an inoffensive man of a sociable disposition, who enjoyed his glass of wine, but always in moderation. He voted against Pattison, and this is how he appears in the *Memoirs*: "A wretched *crétin* of the name of Gibbs, who was always glad to come and booze at the college port a week or two when his vote was wanted in support of old abuses." In the same book Pattison claims to have been a most successful tutor, I believe not without reason. The secret of his success did not lie in any charm of manner. A friend was once smoking with him after dinner, when one of his pupils came in with an essay. Pattison read it, and then, without a word, crumpled up the paper and threw it in the writer's face. I have asked several of Pattison's old pupils about his lectures, and they all told me that he used to let the men translate and explain, and that he himself said hardly anything. Perhaps he thought that the most valuable part of a man's education is that which he gives himself. Other great educators have found an effective method in silence. When Balliol and New College combined their teaching, a friend of mine one evening took an essay to Jowett. The subject was highly polemical. My friend had taken a line which he thought would be directly contrary to Jowett's opinions, and he was burning to reply to objections and to battle out the question. Jowett listened to the essay, and then said, in his cherubic tones: "You are a New College man, I think?" The writer replied that he was. "Good night," said Jowett.

Pattison's resignation of the tutorship, the blame of which he throws on the Rector, was characteristic. During the Crimean War the college was half empty, and the fund divisible among the tutors was greatly diminished. Pattison insisted that his own pay should remain the same, and the loss fall on the two other tutors; and when Thompson refused to make this arrangement he "indignantly threw up" the tutorship. The truth is that at this time Pattison was hardly in his right mind; he had been so affected by failing to gain the headship. Yet few men have been more unfit to be Head of a college. As chairman of a meeting of the fellows, his inefficiency was such that, like Thomas Sheridan's dullness, "it must have taken him a deal of 'pains' to acquire it. With him for chairman, business which would now be dispatched in two or three hours took from ten in the morning till dinner time. He would allow talk to wander far and wide away from the subject, and when at last the most garrulous were silent, he would not put the question to the vote, but wait awhile, and then say something which started the whole discussion over again. This habit of

his once proved beneficial in an unintended quarter. There was a bibulous cook, who became more and more careless, and his dinners worse and worse, till the undergraduates sent up an indignant petition signed by nearly every man in college. After a long debate, including a history from West of the last half-dozen college cooks and a dissertation on how to organise a college kitchen, it was plain that everyone thought the man must go. Then came the usual pause, and then Pattison murmured, as if speaking to himself, "But how well he roasts a partridge." Finally the man was reprieved.

Nor was Pattison better fitted to be Head from the undergraduate point of view. Not only had he no sympathy with the ordinary men from the public schools, but he positively disliked them. There is a story which, I think, has already been told by Mr. Andrew Clark. Pattison invited a freshman to walk with him to Iffley. After proceeding some distance in silence, the freshman felt it incumbent on him to make some literary remark. Accordingly he observed, "The irony of Sophocles is greater than the irony of Euripides." Pattison gave him a sour look, but said nothing. On they went till they reached Iffley, and there they turned. Then Pattison broke silence. He snarled out, "Quote." But no quotation was forthcoming, so they finished the walk with no further conversation on either side. If the young man had talked of horses or of fishing, or had told a gay story, he would have found that Pattison was a more human person than he appeared.

The fellow of his college whom Pattison hated the most was Metcalfe, and the sentiment was cordially reciprocated. Metcalfe was an importation from Cambridge, where, according to report, he killed a man in a fight. Oxford or Cambridge men who migrate to what Mr. Foker called "the other shop," sometimes take every opportunity of impressing on their new associates the immeasurable superiority of everybody and everything in the University they have quitted. Metcalfe was free from this failing, but he could not be called a conciliatory person. Once in common-room after dinner he rang the bell violently, and when Harris, the butler, came puffing into the room, "John," he said, "bring me some cotton wool to put in my ear. My nerves are perfectly shattered by Mr. O's vulgar laughter on my left." At another time he formally complained at a college meeting that West had omitted to pass him the mustard at dinner. Metcalfe was vicar of St. Michael's, and he would observe with some complacency that when he first went to the parish there were only ten dissenters in it, and now there were over eighty. Formerly every fellow of Lincoln held the office of bursar in rotation. When Metcalfe's turn came to an end, and it was his duty to pay out moneys, his accounts appeared in such hopeless confusion that towards the close of the audit day no progress had been made in rectifying them; and Metcalfe retired to his rooms and "sporting the oak," heedless

of the hammering of disappointed and indignant people seeking cheques and finding none. Metcalfe was a Scandinavian scholar of considerable distinction, and he did a real service to classical education by translating, and to some degree editing, Becker's *Charicles* and *Gallus*, books which, for a long time, were to English students the chief, if not the only, source of information about private life in ancient Greece and Rome.

Outside of Lincoln College the principal object of Metcalfe's dislike was Burgon, whom he always called *Graculus asuriens*, for Burgon was partly of Greek extraction, and whom he accused of interfering in his parish. Possibly the charge had some foundation, for Burgon's energy led him at times to meddle with what hardly concerned him. Thus, though himself an Oriel man, he published a pamphlet condemning the number of hot breakfasts on Sunday in Christ Church. With all his abilities, his sayings and doings often presented a grotesque aspect, and when he preached men used to go to the church in the hope of hearing something laughable. One day in the University pulpit, when defending the traditional age of man, he apostrophised the palaeolithic implements adduced to disprove it with the exclamation, "Go to, ye little stones." Burgon was fond of apostrophe. On another occasion he employed it to demolish the Darwinian theory, "Ye men of science," said he, "ye men of science, leave me my ancestors in Paradise, and I do not grudge you yours in the Zoological Gardens."

Beyond Oxford, West was known as the greatest plural voter of the day, and was cited as such by John Bright in one of his speeches. West made a practice of purchasing small properties all over the country to acquire votes, and when a general election occurred he hurried from place to place, voting wherever the contest was closest. But with all his votes, and though his purse was open for electioneering purposes, he did not carry much weight or exercise much influence in the counsels of the Conservative party at Oxford. In the University he first became conspicuous when he held the post of pro-proctor. He would put his gown into a carpet bag, and take the train to places like Abingdon, in order to catch some peccant undergraduate. I remember much amusement being caused by two eminently respectable persons, one of them now an Ambassador, when out for a constitutional, being stopped by some good-natured soul, who misunderstood the purpose of their walk, and warned them that "West was at Eynsham." By this conduct West made himself for the time the most unpopular man in Oxford, and when Commemoration arrived the disturbance was terrific. It slightly abated for a moment to allow Lord Palmerston to receive the D.C.L., and then broke out again with renewed vigour. West faced the music unflinchingly, till his friends with difficulty persuaded him to withdraw. That was the most disorderly Commemoration I remember. The Commemoration

at which the applause was greatest was that to which our present King and Queen came shortly after their marriage. The stately Chancellor, Lord Derby, in the course of his speech, asked why should he dilate on the charms of the bride.* "*Ipsa adest*," he exclaimed, extending his hand towards the Princess. She smiled, and the cheering shook the theatre. Of all the jokes at Commemoration, somehow only one remains in my mind. Sir Travers Twiss was introducing someone for a degree, and applying to him a string of superlatives, *vir doctissimus, insignissimus, praeclarissimus*; — "*et Travers-twississimus*," cried out some wag in the gallery. I may here record another undergraduate witticism, though not at Commemoration. By the change of a single letter the notices in the Parks were made to read thus: "Persons bringing dons into the Parks are requested to lead them by a string, and to prevent them from chasing the water-fowls."

Pattison extols the financial genius West showed as bursar. A later generation discovered that West had played the part of a Chancellor of the Exchequer in an expiring government who presents a popular Budget by postponing all possible expenses for his successor to meet. As soon as the agricultural depression set in West resigned the post. Till that time he devoted his mind to the business of bursar. It coloured his thoughts on all occasions, and when he was preaching for a friend on the guilt of Judas, he chiefly concerned himself with criticising the unbusinesslike conduct of Judas in accepting such inadequate remuneration as thirty pieces of silver. Friends who entered his college rooms were struck with the total absence of books. With one book West was familiar; he had a curious acquaintance with Napier's "Peninsular War." But, as is often the case with people who read little, his conversation was racy, and visitors sometimes pronounced him the most entertaining man in the common-room. He saw great variations of fortune. As an undergraduate he was so poor that he used a newspaper instead of a cloth for his breakfast table; and when he became a curate he grew no flowers in his garden, but planted potatoes, which he sold in the neighbouring town; and he died leaving £100,000.

Of Calcott, it need only be remarked that he was a very infirm old gentleman, who nevertheless liked to take part in a scholarship examination, when he always voted for the candidates who put *quippe qui* in their Latin prose. Another Fellow was a more original character. At the beginning of term he promised to pay his scout £3, but added that he should deduct a shilling for every instance of inattention. When the term ended the scout expected his money; but was shown an account in which he turned out to be considerably in his master's debt. This Fellow married, and took a college living. Here one day Pattison and West came to discuss some expenditure which he and his wife wished the college to undertake. Pattison

stiffly refused, and just then, the baby was brought in, and being exhibited to Pattison began to cry. The mother took the child and dandled it, saying, "Poor little thing; was it frightened, then, at "the nasty, great, UGLY man?" So the lady had her revenge. This quaint person was an accomplished scholar. Once, writing to the bursar on some business matter, he composed the letter in Latin elegiacs. These were somewhat thrown away on West.

Of "Tommy Fowler" I shall say little. His practical wisdom and genial nature are fresh in many memories. One small joke about him may be recorded. He was an ardent traveller, and towards the end of his life he became very fat. He had gone off to some disturbed country, Russia, I think; and the question was anxiously put whether he had been arrested as a conspirator. "No," was the reply, "but he "has been dispersed as a crowd."

Fowler's predecessor as Professor of Logic was Wall, of Balliol, who had been a noted "coach" in his younger days. Late in life he married a pretty young girl, and the undergraduates used to say that in his lecture on Aristotle's *Ethics* he always cited this act of his as an example of *akolasia*.

"Tommy Short," of Trinity, had conferred a great benefit on his college by helping to throw the scholarships open. He stood at the same time as Arnold for the mastership of Rugby, and was defeated by only one vote. If appointed he would probably have made a good headmaster, but would hardly have "changed the face of education all "through the public schools of England." He had been Newman's tutor, and on one occasion at least played an important part in the career of the future Cardinal. Newman was a candidate for an Oriel fellowship, but in the course of the examination he became down-hearted, and resolved to retire. Going to tell his tutor of his intention, he found him sitting down to luncheon. Short insisted that Newman should join him, and presently Newman rose from the table refreshed and inspirited, and shortly was elected a fellow of Oriel. What the dish was which brought about this happy result is recorded in Newman's *Letters*. It was a dish of lamb cutlets and fried parsley. Short had a sententious way of speaking. Once, when an undergraduate asked to be excused attendance at his lecture in order to get a day's hunting, Short elicited that he had only one horse, and had been out with the hounds lately. So he replied, "A righteous "man regardeth the life of his beast." The young man explained that his horse was in excellent condition, and would be none the worse for being taken out; but the only answer he could get to all his representations was: "A righteous man regardeth the life of his "beast." The next day he duly attended the lecture. At the end of a quarter of an hour Short proclaimed that the class had gone far enough for that day, and, beckoning to him, said: "If you go at once "by such-and-such a way you will be just in time for the meet." But

this happened in the long ago. Short was admitted scholar of Trinity in 1808, and was still a fellow of the college in 1879.

In the late sixties some of the best talk in Oxford was to be heard in Merton common-room, where Creighton and other shrewd wits congregated; but the dominant spirit there was W. C. Sidgwick. Creighton was one of the first in Oxford to be affected by the æsthetic movement, and the walls of his rooms were plastered with china plates, a decoration not altogether congruous with college rooms. Musgrave Wilkins was also a resident fellow of Merton, but added little to the pleasure of the common-room, being, unfortunately, completely deaf. He always carried paper tablets for his friends to write on; but as he talked much faster than they could write, a conversation with him resembled a game of cross-questions and crooked answers. Personally, however, I would rather scribble on a tablet than shout in a deaf man's ear. Wilkins consoled himself for his infirmity by good living. He had an excellent cellar of wine, and before he entertained bottles might be seen in his room, carefully arranged at various distances from the fire, each with a thermometer at its side to ensure its coming to table at exactly the right temperature.

Among the undergraduates a quaint figure was that of G. Simcox, who disappeared so mysteriously a few years ago. His speech and his laugh were equally droll, and as soon as he took up *Punch* in the Union, men would gather round him. In an examination a prudent examiner strictly confines himself to asking questions. But when Simcox was undergoing *viva voce* in moderations, he lured an inexperienced moderator into translating a passage of Greek, and then, to the delight of the gallery, Simcox observed in a squeaky voice, "Isn't 'that just a little bald?" Generally the undergraduates regarded examinations and lectures lightly, therein showing a truer sense of perspective than their tutors; for if a man was not going to be a schoolmaster, what did it matter whether he got a second or a third-class? I do not say this from any wish to join in the attack so commonly made now on examinations. In my humble opinion, capacity to produce their knowledge readily in an intelligible form is for most men as valuable a possession as the knowledge itself. The examination system has now lasted for many years, and its defects are therefore manifest, while the evils from which it delivered us have been forgotten. It is a pretty safe guess that long before this century is over reformers will be complaining about the futile character of much that is styled research.

Women take lectures and examinations more seriously than undergraduates ever did. Soon after the Oxford schools had been opened to them, a girl entered for Smalls. She took her seat and grasped the examination paper anxiously, and when she had read it from end to end she spread her arms on the table, rested her head upon

them, and wept bitterly. But taking so grave a view of examinations, women often do well in them. Some years ago in the schools there was found on the table where a man had been sitting a scrap with the following lines scribbled on it. (It must be premised that examiners often mark the candidates' papers with the first three letters of the Greek or English alphabet, adding a *plus* or *minus* to signify that the paper is good or bad of the class):

I have read for three years with a crammer,
But all I can get is a Gamma,
While that girl over there
With the flaming red hair
Gets an a plus quite easily, d—— her.

This, however, was subsequent to the days with which this paper is chiefly concerned. In the sixties the notion of women in the schools would have met only with ridicule.

At that time a curious episode occurred in the history of Greats. Robert Williams, commonly known as Student Williams, of Christ Church, a well-known private "coach," boasted that he had reduced the philosophy paper, which then went very far in determining a man's class, to a limited number of possible questions; and he provided his pupils with answers to each of these. For an examination or two Williams was very successful, but then the examiners put their heads together, and devised a paper which entirely baffled this mechanical method of cramming. Williams subsequently got a fellowship at Merton, and went to the bar. He used to tell a story at his own expense. Montagu Williams was then practising in the criminal courts. One day an old hand was brought up for trial, and when he heard that Williams was the prosecuting counsel he pleaded guilty. But as soon as Robert Williams stood up the fellow roared out: "Not guilty; I plead not guilty. I thought Monty was prosecuting. I didn't know it was that bloke."

Generally, in the Oxford of those days college lectures were not of a high standard. Honour lectures were mostly undertaken by young men, who had just been elected fellows, and who were residing for a year or two before quitting Oxford. Thus, though the lecturers had plenty of ability, they seldom possessed the knowledge necessary for a really good lecture. The result was that the students were thrown to a great degree on their own resources, and an excellent result it was. Teaching in Oxford is now much better, but it may be questioned whether the education is as good. These remarks are meant to apply only to Greats.

But enough. A glass of small beer is well in its way, but who wants a gallon of it?

HUGH E. P. PLATT.

FREE TRADE, AND THE LATE MINISTRY.

The two former articles by the same writer on this subject, of which the following is a continuation, appeared in January, 1903, and February, 1905.

A PART from the vague proposals in his speeches, Mr. Chamberlain's single actual achievement in Tariff Reform was to apply a strictly protective system as an experiment for five years to a commodity not produced in this country, a necessary of life, second only in importance to wheat. This action was opposed by the Liberal Party in Parliament and in the country, and they pledged themselves to end it at the earliest practicable moment. In due time the policy was also submitted to and condemned by the general body of electors, who placed in power a huge majority charged with the duty of maintaining Free Trade. The five years to which Mr. Chamberlain committed us are now almost at an end, rich with the actual experience derived from his enterprise. In every respect these results have proved exactly the opposite of what he promised. No benefits have accrued to the nation, no increase of trade to its Colonies; but, on the other hand, every anticipation of failure and loss against which he was warned has been justified. Under these circumstances the nation will learn with profound amazement to-morrow or next day that its guardians have so far failed to fulfil their undertaking, that Mr. Chamberlain's fantastic experiment is not to be ended, but continued for another five years, without the possibility of that annual revision for which even he left room. Thus Protection is to be stereotyped and Free Trade sacrificed, and (apparently) all is to be done without discussion or explanation in Parliament. Such is the difficult position in which Mr. Asquith's new Government finds itself placed by a decision of the late Ministry, and only a few months remain to him to extricate himself from a grave dilemma.

Perhaps I may preface the explanation of this critical situation with a word of warning as to the difficulty of interpreting official utterances on either Tariff Reform or Free Trade. When Mr.

Chamberlain said, "Silk is gone, iron is threatened, cotton will go," it is hardly unjust to him to say that, strictly speaking, he was not thinking seriously either of silk or iron or cotton. The words were only a feint to direct the attention of his opponents to a different part of the field from that in which he was at work. His thoughts were in the West Indies, where permanent prosperity was to be restored by his plan for increasing the production of sugar, while in this country there was to be a revival of the great industry of sugar refining, in which "tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands" of men were to be employed. Mr. Chamberlain knew that as Cobden had broken down the old Protective system by opening the ports to corn, so he could set it up again by closing them to sugar. His speeches may thus be disregarded, but what he did was all important, and by this alone he is judged. The late Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman will be judged in precisely the same way. There can be no discourtesy to any of its members in saying that none of them have uttered such an effective defence of Free Trade as Mr. Chamberlain did between 1880 and 1885; yet twenty years afterwards he was quite as eloquent on the other side. With this experience before them the friends of Free Trade may well remember that nothing is injured, and nothing is mended merely by speeches, however eloquent, but that the safety of the great cause depends alone on the policy which is actually pursued.

The first description of the Sugar Convention appeared in this magazine in January, 1903. It came into operation on the 1st September of that year, and the second article, which appeared in February, 1905, explained the results up to that time, so that so much of the history as it is necessary to recall before dealing with the steps taken by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Government need occupy but a small space. The Convention was to last for five years until September 1st, 1908, and it contained a provision that it might be terminated then or in any subsequent year if one year's notice were given. The parties to it were the chief Continental sugar-producing Powers and the United Kingdom, and its declared object was to suppress direct or indirect sugar bounties by which the production or exportation of sugar might profit. This object was to be effected either by levying an extra duty, to be fixed by the Convention, or by prohibiting the import of sugar from any country whose system it condemned. As all the other countries were producers and the sole importer was the United Kingdom, the loss and burden fell upon her, while great advantages accrued to them. In favour of the Convention, it was stated that bounties were hostile to the principles of Free Trade; that although no sugar was produced in the United Kingdom, yet production in the West Indies would increase after their suppression; that the price of sugar would not advance; that the industry of refining was capable of great

expansion, and that no danger would arise to the great industries which had grown up out of sugar as a raw material. On the other hand, it was pointed out that a bounty is the antidote to a tariff. It can be no business of ours to take steps against assistance given to foreign producers. Tariffs injure us; bounties help us. The Convention could only succeed by causing a rise in prices; its enforcement would require the closing of our ports to supplies, the bonding of refineries, and the restoration of certificates of origin, and such restrictions must be highly injurious to a branch of commerce which depended largely for its supplies of raw material upon the countries which had devised the arrangement. These and other grave objections obtained the adhesion in Parliament of the whole body of the Liberal Party and its leaders, with the exception of Sir Edward Grey.

The first debate took place in November, 1902, on the resolution proposed by Mr. Gerald Balfour, President of the Board of Trade, to approve the policy embodied in the Convention, and pledging the country to pass the necessary measures to make it binding. The rejection of this motion was moved in an able speech by Sir William Harcourt, who was supported by Sir William Robson, now Attorney-General, Mr. Thomas Shaw, now Lord Advocate, and Sir Robert Reid, now Lord Chancellor; but at the close of the sitting the debate was closed, and the resolution carried by a majority of 104. The next debate was on the first reading of the Bill, which was introduced under the Ten Minutes' Rule, on the 28th May, 1903. The unusual course of claiming a division was taken, and the first reading was only carried by a majority of 60. The second reading was taken on the 28th and 29th July. In the course of the discussion, Mr. Winston Churchill, now President of the Board of Trade, said:

This Bill . . . is a working model submitted to us for inspection before we lay down the plant on a larger scale. . . . We have to consider the proposal to increase the price of sugar, for that is what the Convention practically does as far as we are concerned, in conjunction with the Colonial Secretary's proposal to put a considerable tax on corn, and with his plan of putting a tax on meat, including bacon, . . . butter, cheese, and eggs. The right hon. gentleman will contradict me if I am wrong.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain replied: "No, Sir, I cannot contradict 'the hon. gentleman.'"

The debate was wound up by Mr. Chamberlain, and on a division the second reading was carried by a majority of 88, the Liberals being supported by 11 Free Trade Unionists. The Bill was then considered in Committee on the 4th and 5th August, and very prolonged discussions took place. One of the most important points

raised was directed towards exempting our exports of sugared goods, and an amendment to this effect was supported by no fewer than eight members who were afterwards included in the future Liberal Government. Among them was Mr. Asquith who said:

It was far too serious a matter to tamper with the interests and the security of one of the most valuable and the most growing industries of this country, in order to save a few hours of Parliamentary time, and he strongly hoped that the House would accept the Amendment.

The Bill was, however, carried through Committee without alteration at three o'clock in the morning.

After the Bill became law the interest of the Liberal Party in the question continued, and a debate of great importance took place on the King's Speech on the 28th February, 1905. By that time the country had had eighteen months' experience of the Convention. Mr. Kearley, now Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Trade, moved that the Government, in committing the country to the policy of the Brussels Sugar Convention,

had inflicted heavy losses on trade, diminished employment of labour, enormously increased the cost of a necessary food to consumers, without any compensatory advantage; and we humbly submit to your Majesty that these evil results call for an immediate remedy; and that the Convention should be denounced at the earliest possible moment.

The debate lasted the best part of two days, the Convention being defended by Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Bonar Law, and Mr. Gerald Balfour, then President of the Board of Trade. The greatest interest, however, attaches to the declarations and votes of a large number of those who were to become, in less than a year, members of the Liberal Cabinet.

Mr. Lloyd-George, on whom, perhaps, the chief responsibility rests, as he became Mr. Gerald Balfour's successor at the Board of Trade, declared that

The Convention was the first great object lesson of Mr. Chamberlain's policy It was he who was responsible for this monstrosity Since the Convention had been adopted the price of sugar had gone down to half on the Continent, while it had almost doubled in this country If we kept up sugar to its present price—and it might indeed go up still higher—this country would actually lose something like £9,000,000 in the course of a year 15,000 persons had been thrown out of employment, while about 50,000, practically 50 per cent. of those engaged in the industry, were out on half-time. . . . It involved the exclusion from our markets of sugar from Russia.

Mr. McKenna, now First Lord of the Admiralty, said—

Every prophecy they (the Conservatives) made, and on which they founded the Bill, had been falsified, and yet they assured the House that if they had the chance they would again enter into the Convention and would tie the hands of the House . . . We were paying now at the rate of ten millions a year more for our sugar than was paid before the Convention came into force . . . That Convention had probably done more harm than any other single Act of Parliament in the recollection of any member of the House.

Mr. Bryce, afterwards Chief Secretary for Ireland, said:

The Convention might have been intended as a measure of retaliation. If so, the retaliation had taken the form of making sugar cheaper for the foreigner and dearer for ourselves. . . . There never was a case in which it had been shown so clearly that this country was receiving a maximum of inconvenience for a minimum of benefit to the West Indies. . . . The whole moral of this was that they should leave trade alone.

Mr. Sydney Buxton, now Postmaster-General, said:

Whether they looked at the Convention from the point of view of the supposed advantage to the West Indies, the enormous disadvantages of our consumers and manufacturers, or the increased price which had followed it, the words of the amendment properly condemned it, and the judgment of the country would condemn it as well.

Mr. Runciman, now President of the Board of Education, said:

The Convention had resulted in a loss of something like £8,000,000 a year to this country. . . . Sugar had had a peculiar political history, and brought about the fall of Lord Melbourne's Administration in 1841; it brought into peril Sir Robert Peel in 1844, Lord John Russell in 1846, and it had certainly not benefited the standing of the present Government in the year 1904.

The division was then taken. Among those who voted in favour of the motion were no fewer than thirty members of the coming Liberal Administration, who thus bound themselves to denounce the Convention at the earliest possible moment. These included Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. McKenna, Mr. John Morley, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Sinclair, and Mr. Herbert Gladstone, all members of the present or the late Liberal Cabinet; also Sir William Robson, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Whiteley, among other members of the Administration. The motion was supported by 211 members, and represented the high-water

mark of the strength of the Free Trade Opposition, being defeated by 65 only.

It is now desirable to set out the actual results on our commerce, brought down to a later period. So far from increasing in accordance with the forecasts, the export of sugar from the West Indies decreased from 2,954,606 cwts. in 1901 to 2,846,353 cwts. in 1906. The imports from the Islands to the United Kingdom diminished from 845,246 cwts. in 1902 to 772,632 cwts. in 1907, and to these facts it is only necessary to add that the chief outlet for West Indian sugar during the period has proved to be Canada, which has never been in the Convention; and if the further adhesion of the Mother Country should be the means of leading the Dominion into relations with these Continental producers, a blow would be struck at the best outlet of the West Indian producer.

The following table shows in pounds per head of the inhabitants the progress of consumption of sugar in the United Kingdom and the two chief European producing countries during the last six years for which returns are available:—

		1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906
United Kingdom		86.07	80.45	78.97	80.37	71.94	81.19
Germany		26.94	25.51	27.39	37.85	31.48	36.50
France		23.97	25.85	29.67	33.31	29.57	32.61

When it is remembered that our consumption of sugar had grown steadily since 1840, when it was 19lbs. per head, it will be seen what a serious change is taking place in the relative position of this country, as compared with its rivals. They have increased, but we have decreased, and the progress has been such as to indicate that if it continues our supremacy in those branches of manufacture which depend on sugar as a raw material may be destroyed.

The table which shows most clearly the effects of the Convention on price is the quotation for the standard quality of sugar (88 per cent. beet f.o.b. at Hamburg) during the last seven years:—

	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908 (5 mos.)
Shillings p. cwt.	7.16	8.44	10.07	10.68	8.81	9.47	10.80

It is not possible to misunderstand the above table, nor can the results which it shows be traced to any other source than the Convention. These prices represent the averages throughout the year, and they may be taken as the minimum at which sugar was bought. For six years previous to 1902 the price had gradually diminished, but for the six years afterwards there is an equally steady rise. During the last four months of 1904 and the first four months of 1905 very high prices ruled, ranging from 10s. 4d. to 15s. 7d. It was

in January, 1905, that Sir Alfred Jones said, "Thanks are due to Mr. Chamberlain; it is he who has brought sugar up from £6 to £16 per ton." It is not, however, practicable, even from the above table, to estimate the total cost in money of the Convention to this country, because it is quite possible—if it had not been in existence—that prices would have fallen lower than the quotations of 1903. Every shilling per cwt. which the population of the United Kingdom was made to pay in excess for its sugar represents roughly an annual tax of £2,000,000; therefore the estimate of a loss at the rate of £8,000,000 per annum made by several members of the Cabinet, including the late Prime Minister, is probably not far wide of the mark.

The prophecy that a great stimulus would be given to the refining industry has proved quite delusive. No doubt a slightly larger quantity of the sugar consumed is refined in this country, but the operation is largely mechanical, and it can never hold out the prospect of a wide field of employment. At the beginning of the period there were fifteen refineries, and now the number has decreased to thirteen. Judging by our total imports, the country that has gained most is Germany, who sent us, in 1906, 1,203,873 cwts. more sugar than in 1902, the total quantity in each year being about two-thirds of our imports. Comparing the same years, our imports from France showed a diminution, while from Russia and Argentina—who had formerly sent us considerable supplies—we received none, owing to the prohibitions. This summary states the situation with sufficient clearness to enable us now to consider the proceedings adopted during the summer of 1907.

With such results before us it is almost impossible to see how there could be any doubt about taking the step to which Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman himself and his Ministers were pledged by their votes in the House of Commons on Mr. Kearley's motion in February, 1905, of denouncing the Convention at the earliest possible moment. Unfortunately, however, this simple and obvious course was set aside.

It was a grave misfortune to the cause of Free Trade that the negotiations fell into the hands of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who had taken a different line from his colleagues in all the debates connected with the Convention. In the year 1896 Sir Edward Grey was appointed by Mr. Chamberlain a member of a small Commission which visited the West Indian Islands, in order to inquire into the conditions and "prospects of the sugar-growing West India Colonies." This experience appears to have affected his judgment, not only with regard to sugar, but also upon certain aspects of the larger question of Free Trade, in which it was destined to play such a prominent part. Sir Edward Grey supported the various extravagant grants to the West Indies, which

formed a conspicuous feature of the administration of the Conservative Governments between 1896 and 1902, and from which the idea of the Sugar Convention gradually emerged as the patience of Parliament became exhausted, and could no longer be relied on for money subventions. The first direct reference to the Convention was contained in a motion brought forward in July, 1902, to grant a final subsidy of £250,000 to help the Islands "until the sugar bounties were abolished," in favour of which Sir Edward Grey spoke and voted. In the opposition to the resolution, the first and second readings of the Bill, and all the divisions taken in Committee to give effect to the Convention, he took no part whatever. It is no injustice to him, therefore, to say that his attitude, if not absolutely sympathetic with the position of Mr. Chamberlain, was in direct hostility to Free Trade opinion as represented by the Liberal Party.

The negotiations with regard to the denunciation of the Convention thus fell into rather unsympathetic hands, and, except in the restricted form of answers to questions, the only Parliamentary explanation up to the present moment of the steps that were taken was afforded in a debate on Supply by Sir Edward Grey on the 1st of August, 1907:

What we have endeavoured to do is to secure arrangements whereby, supposing the Convention continues and we remain a party to the Convention, we shall be free from any risk of having our markets restricted by the decision of the majority of Powers, whose interest at a given moment in the future may not coincide economically with our own.

In this diplomatic language the truth was broken to the Liberals and Free Traders that, after all, the Convention was to be continued. The plan consisted of a declaration that we would no longer prohibit imports of sugar from countries which were condemned by the Permanent Commission, under Article IV, of the original Convention. But even if this could be done it would by no means exhaust the objectionable features of the Convention. We should still be obliged to demand certificates of origin from importers to bond factories, to accept the decision of the Permanent Commission on what is sugar or a sugared product, and to wear the fetters on our commerce and freedom contained in the other eleven Articles. In considering the attempt to get rid of it we must remember that this penal clause has already been once modified in favour of the United Kingdom. The original idea was to enforce countervailing duties such as are applied by all the other contracting States. It was only when this was found to be impracticable in our case that the present form of the clause was adopted. Now that five years' experience makes further prohibition impracticable, an attempt is made to find yet

another alternative. What our Government offered was first to make the Commission permanent for five years, and, secondly, to substitute a new clause in the following terms:

After the 1st September, 1908, the contracting States may demand that, in order to enjoy the benefits of the Convention, sugar refined in the United Kingdom and thence exported to their territories shall be accompanied by a certificate stating that none of this sugar comes from a country recognised by the permanent Commission as granting bounties.

This is the new penal clause, the text of which was published in a White Paper in October last, and it is fortunate that there has been a little time to consider it in connection with the explanation given by Sir Edward Grey in the House of Commons, quoted above. The first objection to the new clause is that it is difficult to interpret. Does the word sugar contained in it imply sugar-sweetened products, such as preserves, chocolates, biscuits, milk, and all other analogous products, as stipulated in the first Article of the original Convention? This is a point of the utmost gravity to us. If sugared products are not covered, the clause can have little application to the contracting States, as most of them refine their own sugar; but, on the other hand, Sir H. G. Bergne stated clearly and definitely that Great Britain could not undertake to furnish certificates of origin in regard to sugared products. Why, then, is not this proviso embodied in the clause? On a matter so vital to our commerce there should be perfect frankness and plain dealing for the guidance of exporters.

Apart from this, however, the clause places the British trader in a most humiliating position. A question will have to be asked in connection with all purchases. Some consignments of sugar (having emanated mainly from Germany) will occupy an unquestioned position, while others will have a tainted origin. The effect of this will at once express itself in price, and the market will not be free. Therefore this proviso looks neither clear nor practicable, and it is difficult to foresee the result of its operation. But a more serious situation has arisen since Sir Edward Grey made his statement in Parliament. Germany refused to sanction the clause without further conditions; and in a subsequent paper, published in February of this year, we read that "the German Government gave it to be understood that their ratification of the new instrument must depend on the adhesion of Russia to the Convention on terms which were acceptable to the great producing States." This question of the adhesion of Russia had been discussed in 1903, and it was then found to be inadmissible, and during the whole period of the Convention our ports have been closed to exports from that country. The object of Germany in again raising the question now becomes apparent in a moment. Owing to the exclusion from this

country of Russian sugar during the last five years, vast stocks have accumulated, and Germany saw that if our ports were opened to these supplies on the 1st of September her monopoly of our market would be seriously interfered with. Thus it became necessary to have a further sitting in November to consider the inclusion of Russia. The secret deliberations, which lasted over a fortnight, are described in a very few words in the despatch—Russia refused to change her sugar system, which the Convention had condemned—and after various alternative suggestions were discussed the only plan that could be evolved to meet the difficulty was that she should agree with the other great Powers to limit her exports to the European markets, so that they should not exceed one million tons during the next six years, or 200,000 tons in any single year. Thus Sir Edward Grey's scheme of having our markets free "from any risk of being restricted" by the decision of the majority of the Powers was destroyed, and we are brought back to a position scarcely less humiliating than the one we have occupied during the past five years.

Before accepting the inclusion of Russia, our Government directed its representative to declare that its assent to the provisions enabling Russia to adhere to the Convention does not imply assent to the stipulation leading to the restriction of exportation. The meaning of this is obvious. Sir Edward Grey had declared to Parliament that "we must not find ourselves artificially bound by the decisions of other Powers to a restricted market." Germany then says: "We will restrict your market by imposing restraints on the Russian exports to the United Kingdom as a condition of her entering the Convention." Then Sir Edward Grey explains: "I assent to Russia coming in, but do not assent to the restrictions." But these restrictions will be operative, and that is the only material point to us. The effect of this tortuous diplomacy on British commerce was shown immediately by the progress of quotations on the sugar market. When Sir Edward Grey announced boldly that all restrictions would be removed from British imports in August, 1907, the standard quotation was 9s. 10d. per cwt., and it gradually fell to 9s. 3¾d. in November, the month in which the Permanent Commission met to reconsider the situation. The decision then arrived at, and the acquiescence of this country in it, led to an immediate change in the position; the price became 9s. 8d. in December, 9s. 10¾d. in January and February, 10s. 11¼d. in March, and 11s. 8d. in April; and the outlook points to still higher prices to the end of the present season. Thus a total rise of 2s. 5d. per cwt., or rather over a farthing per pound, takes place on our market as a result of Germany having succeeded in her effort to restrict the quantity that we might receive in any one year from Russia. Such a rise must be a profound inconvenience to our great

manufactures, which depend on large supplies of the raw material, and it arises directly from "our markets being restricted by the "decision of the majority of the Powers" at a time when vast accumulations of sugar are causing distress and ruin to great industries in Russia.

This question of the treatment of Russia raises in a very acute form many of the less obvious issues connected with the Convention. The area under beet cultivation in that country has largely increased during the last ten years, and Russia is at present the second beet growing country in the world. The original Convention was passed into law on the 10th of August, 1903. On the morning of the 13th a proclamation was issued prohibiting Russian imports. Out of this action a curious incident arose which illustrates the somewhat equivocal part the Board of Trade has played from the commencement in connection with the Convention. I stated in an article published in September, 1903, that we had received 100,000 tons of sugar from Russia through the German ports during the previous year. I had received this information on the Sugar Market, but could obtain no official confirmation. It was repeatedly questioned in Parliament, especially by the President of the Board of Trade, who stated that our receipts were only 1,000 tons; but in the debate of 1905 he acknowledged that subsequent investigation convinced him that he was wrong, and he added that he was prepared to admit that he might have been wrong to the extent of 20,000 tons, but he argued that he was still much nearer the truth than I was. This incident is worth recalling in connection with the discussions which took place during the Session of the Commission held at Brussels in December, 1907, on the question of restricting Russian supplies. A very carefully prepared paper, drawn up by the Board of Trade, was submitted to show that the restrictions placed on Russia would, after all, leave us an ample margin above any imports we had received from that country during the last ten years. This document, which could not be produced in 1903 or 1905, shows that as far back as 1896 we may have received over 100,000 tons of Russian sugar in one year, and that in the year 1903—on which I had based my statement—the imports, which terminated on the 13th August, were probably 76,000 tons. These figures differ materially from those published in August, 1907, in the "Return on "Sugar," issued to the House of Commons. Thus information appears to be available or not available at the Board of Trade at any particular moment, as it may be required in support of the policy of the Convention.

It is now admitted that the accumulations of stocks in Russia, after five years' prohibition of exports to Great Britain, amount to no less than 500,000 tons. If we had been able to draw our supplies regularly, prices here all through would have been lower, one or two

panics would have been avoided, and the accumulations, which have had such a disastrous effect on Russian commerce, would not have arisen. Our total annual import amounts to over 1,750,000 tons, and it is not open to dispute that we should be in a position to draw freely on every source of supply. Russia was shut out of the Convention in 1903, in order that our ports might be closed against her, and she is admitted in 1908, in order that the quantity she may send to us shall be restricted. When it is remembered that each shilling rise in price represents a tax of two millions a year on the nation, it will be seen that every diplomatic mistake entails a heavy loss. During the last five years Russia retaliated by imposing an additional duty on British-grown teas, which were imported through the Baltic ports, and this incident affords yet another illustration of the losses and dangers to which this country has had to submit.

The examination, therefore, of this question of the treatment of Russia should satisfy any candid person that it is hopeless to expect open or fair dealing under the Convention. The object which it has in view has never varied—it is simply to raise the price of sugar in this country by restricting the area of supply. As the proceedings are secret, it is impossible to obtain information as to the principles on which any country is condemned. Although the declared object of the Convention is to suppress bounties, yet it openly sets up a surtax, which is a greater infringement of the principles of Free Trade. To suggest that it has succeeded in abolishing bounties is absurd; they are still given in some of our own Colonies and in other parts of the world. Under Article VI. Spain, Italy, and Sweden, although in the Convention, are exempted from the engagement not to give bounties on condition that they do not export sugar. Russia, as we have seen, will not alter her system. All that has been secured is that we should be cut off from large areas of production which happen to be condemned; and in the future, if the Convention is not denounced, means will still be found to achieve the same ends. In March, 1908, a sitting was held to consider an application from Italy that she should be allowed to export up to a maximum of 15,000 tons, but it was refused. Our delegate supported the claim of Italy, but, as in the case of Russia, he was over-ruled. The Italian delegate, in these circumstances, reserved entirely the right of his Government to take the course they judged best; and the report adds: "It remains to be seen whether Italy will decide to 'retire from the Union or not.'" The question for us is what the United Kingdom will decide to do? Italy has a rapidly growing production of beet sugar; we have none.

This analysis reveals the two diplomatic mistakes into which the Government drifted. The first was, of course, that of not adopting the simple expedient of denouncing the Convention in

accordance with the pledges of so many members of the Cabinet, given in February, 1905. The second was made when Germany refused to ratify the additional Act which had been provisionally accepted by the Convention on behalf of Great Britain; and when, in December, it became clear that the promise made by Sir Edward Grey, that no combination of Powers would hereafter be allowed to restrict our imports could not be fulfilled, there should not have been a moment's hesitation in seizing the opportunity of withdrawing altogether. The negotiations were commenced early by us in order that a year's notice might be given of our withdrawal at the 1st September, 1908, but this consideration does not appear to have affected the proceedings of Germany; and it was not until December, 1907, that the arrangement with Russia was arrived at. Several of the other Powers refrained from ratifying either the additional Act with the United Kingdom or the proposed adhesion of Russia until their Parliaments had been consulted. It can hardly be supposed that an equal liberty has not been secured for the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The Act of 1903 only sanctioned the Convention of that year. If it remains law, prohibition may be reimposed at any time. It contains words which indicate that provision *must be made by Parliament* for any arrangement in lieu of such prohibition. It would also be possible under it to denounce the Convention on giving a year's notice at any time, and this conflicts with the new arrangements. It would, therefore, seem that both a resolution and a new Act are necessary, unless the wiser alternative of repealing the Act of 1903 and denouncing the Convention be adopted. If this course is not taken now, what chance is there that it ever will be taken?

A far greater responsibility rests upon the present Government in this matter than upon the Conservative Government of 1902-3 which agreed to join the Convention. The latter was under the influence of Mr. Chamberlain, an openly avowed Protectionist. It had no actual experience to guide it and could not have been quite unmoved by the clamour against the so-called bounties which came from the West Indies and vested interests in this country. Since that time the nation has declared by a great majority in favour of Free Trade, the new Government is pledged to maintain that policy at all costs, and every hope, however legitimate, of any good result arising from the Convention has been disappointed. I have no doubt that the nation may look with confidence to Mr. Asquith to extricate it from the unfortunate position in which it appears to be placed.

THOS. LOUGH.

IBSEN AS A RELIGIOUS TEACHER.

THE two greatest of the dramatic poems of Henrik Ibsen are, in my opinion, "Peer Gynt,"* and "Brand." They are greatest alike in respect to their literary form, the quality of the thought by which they are inspired, and the universality of their teaching. I am persuaded that whatever may be the estimate which future generations will arrive at as to those plays of Ibsen which, like "Ghosts," deal definitely with social problems in a manner which merges upon the pathological, "Peer Gynt" and "Brand" will more and more be recognised as worthy to take a high place amongst the masterpieces of literature which enlarge the bounds of thought and add dignity to the human race.

These dramatic poems were written in the sixties. "Brand" was published shortly before "Peer Gynt." But, having regard to the relationship of the leading ideas which they contain, it is best to take up "Peer Gynt" first. It is with "Peer Gynt" that I am chiefly concerned in this paper. But I propose to emphasise one or two features of "Brand" which help to throw some light on the religious position which Ibsen occupied when he wrote these two great works.

Both poems are religious in their scope and aim. Moreover, they have certain mystical qualities which, to an extent that has not before been pointed out, require us to classify Ibsen as a religious teacher with an even more remarkable mystic of his own race. I refer to Swedenborg. To students of the writings of Swedenborg these plays of Ibsen should have special and peculiar interest. Whether Ibsen was himself a student of Swedenborg I know not. It is a reasonable assumption that, as a cultured Norseman, he had some acquaintance with the works of the Swedish seer. But be this as it may, in my

* For the quotations from "Peer Gynt" which are given in this article the writer is indebted to the excellent translation by William and Charles Archer, published by Walter Scott, Limited, London.

reading of "Peer Gynt" and "Brand" I have several times come across passages which have vividly recalled to my mind things that I have read in the pages of Swedenborg. Many of Ibsen's images are true "correspondences," and may easily be recognised as such by anyone who is acquainted with Swedenborg's doctrine as to the close and actual relationship between spiritual and material things. Either Ibsen studied Swedenborg and was strongly influenced by him, or his own peculiar cast of mind as a mystic was in close affinity to the mind of Swedenborg.

There is one especially important feature of Ibsen's writings—and it is not confined to "Peer Gynt" and "Brand," though it is most conspicuously manifest in those works—in respect to which he may or may not have had hints from Swedenborg. It is a feature which, in any case, must go far to commend him to the Swedenborgian student. Swedenborg tells us that in the other world the environment of a spirit—whether he be angel or devil—is in accordance with the state of his thought and affection, indeed that it is the state of the spirit which creates the environment from moment to moment, in the general and in the particular. To understand Ibsen, especially in the works with which we are now dealing, one of the very first essentials is that we shall perceive, and be able to sympathise with, the peculiar facility with which he adopts for the purpose of the development of his situations and the unfolding of his characters the view that a similar law of the relation of each man's environment to his present spiritual state is operative very largely even here. Of course, when we descend to plain prose, we know quite well that in this physical world the environment does *not* from moment to moment, in the particular as well as in the general, adapt itself to a man's spiritual state. And so far as it does adapt itself it is only slowly and partially. The man who loves the good, the pure and the beautiful will, to the best of his power, seek out and surround himself with good, pure and beautiful things. And similarly the man who is vicious, impure and devoid of the sense of beauty will sink into an environment in accordance with his state. But the process here is never complete, for this is not a spiritual and plastic world.

Ibsen, on his part, is fully conscious of the wide difference that there is between the spiritual and the material planes of existence. But he is a poet, and, moreover, a mystic poet. It was at times a prime requirement of his art that he should ignore the difference; that he should assume that the laws and conditions, which, on the showing of Swedenborg, operate in the spiritual world, also operate here much more largely than they actually do. Once we concede freely and fully the poetic licence which Ibsen in this respect demands—a licence, of course, exercised more or less by all poets, but by him in a peculiar degree—we shall be in

the way to understand him and find pleasure and profit in his work to an extent that is impossible otherwise.

In "Peer Gynt" the feature which I am describing is more manifest than in any other of Ibsen's works. We time after time find characters which can have no more existence in an objective sense on the material plane than has the Ghost of Banquo in "Macbeth." They must be assumed to be subjective creations—the projection, so to speak, of the mind of Peer Gynt himself. But the author makes no attempt to distinguish them from other personages of the poem who are to be regarded as real beings. Why should he? All the characters of the work, real and imaginary—objective or subjective—are, like the incidents which are represented and the localities and scenes which are introduced, correlated and necessary parts of the picture of a soul's working. They must in general be regarded as owing their existence and their place in the picture to the varying psychological conditions of that one soul, and must be considered from the point of view of the way in which they help to the understanding of those conditions. What is true of "Peer Gynt" in this respect is true also of "Brand," which, however, is a work of less wide range.

So much by way of preliminary. Coming now to my more immediate task—the analysis of the two plays—let me say that I regard these works as in some measure complementary. "Peer Gynt" is the story of a man in search of himself, working out the problem of existence first on the lines of self-seeking and afterwards of self-surrender, and accomplishing his end without definite help from the organised Christian Church. "Brand" is the story of a man who strives after self-surrender as a large section of the organised Christian Church commonly commends it, but whose life, nevertheless, from causes which I will in due time explain, ends in failure.

Peer comes before us as a strongly-built youth of twenty years of age. He belongs to a Norwegian family which had once been well-to-do, but had become greatly reduced by recent extravagances. The family is now represented only by Peer and his mother. Peer, with many inherited qualities and defects which are confirmed by his way of life, is a youth of whose future career no confident prediction can be made. His inventiveness, power of imagination, generosity, daring and physical strength might carry him far; but his love of pleasure, aversion to hard work and want of definite purpose in life are serious drawbacks, and make him an object of scorn and derision to the people of his district. There is a strain of nobility in Peer; the qualities which had made his family great in former days often reassert themselves, though neutralised by others which, equally, are inherited and which he fails to resist.

As is to be expected, upon a character such as his women exercise

a powerful influence. His whole tendency at this time is towards wild escapades, drinking, brawling and adventure of every kind, but when at a country wedding he meets Solveig, the woman who is destined ultimately to become his ideal of purity and gentleness and self-abnegation, the possibilities of good in him are even then evoked. But the influence is only momentary. And here it is to be observed that the author rightly connects the insensibility of Peer to pure love and his readiness to succumb to the temptations of impure love with the moral descent from which it seems impossible for him to be held back, and in doing so gives us the first most obvious examples of the symbolism and mysticism which distinguish this poem. The scenes to which we are introduced are so remarkable in this respect that they call for somewhat detailed examination.

Impure love is represented by the three Saeter girls and the Green-clad One, by whom he is at this time encountered. The Green-clad One is the daughter of the Dovrë King, whose Kingdom may be described as "one of the hells." It is an infernal region such as Swedenborg might have pictured had he been a dramatic poet. It is a place where all the true qualities and appearances of things are inverted.

"Black it seems white, and ugly seems fair,
Big it seems little and dirty clean.

My week-day gown is of gold and silk,"

says the Dovrë King's daughter. But Peer, who still retains some of his old virtue and truth of vision, replies:—

"It looks to me liker tow and straw."

Lured by the Dovrë King's daughter Peer shows growing affinity for the life of this Kingdom. He is even willing to espouse the Green-clad One, who joyously exclaims:—

"Ah, Peer, now I see that we fit, you and I."

And he replies:—

"Like the leg and the trouser, the hair and the comb."

The interview between Peer and the Dovrë King's daughter takes place on "a hillside, wooded with soughing trees." A bridal steed appears, to bear him and the woman to the Dovrë Kingdom. This "steed" is a gigantic pig—obviously in correspondence with the now swinish affections of Peer. On the back of this beast, and accompanied by the Green-clad One, Peer makes the journey.

Arrived in the Dovrë Kingdom, he is introduced to the King of the Trolls, the people of this Kingdom. His ambition and love of power are played upon by the tempting prospect of himself being designated the Trolls' prospective ruler.

The Dovrë King explains to Peer the grand distinctive attribute of Trolls:—

“ Out yonder, under the shining vault,
Among men the saying goes : ‘ Man, be thyself ! ’
At home here with us, and the tribe of the Trolls,
The saying goes : ‘ Troll; to thyself be—enough ! ’ ”

The meaning is not obscure. “ Man, be thyself,”—be true to the high purposes of your life—is the counsel of wisdom and goodness. “ Man, to thyself be—enough ”—consider your own appetites and desires alone—is the counsel of folly and evil.

In the worst of men, however, there are providentially preserved remains of good. These are sometimes made operative by pain and fear, and the recollections of lost blessedness. Peer is not long in the Troll Kingdom before the bestiality of the place oppresses him. He protests strongly when it is proposed to furnish him with a tail.

“ None comes courting my child with no tail at his rear,” says the Troll King; and Peer replies with disgust:—

“ Make a beast of a man ! ”

However, he, at length, consents to the addition of the tail. There is music and dancing. The King calls on the “ music maid ” to sound the harp and the “ dancing maid ” to tread the floors of the hall. But there is a tremendous hubbub when Peer refers to the music maid as “ a bell-cow with her hoof on a gut harp-strumming,” and to the dancing maid as “ a sow in socklets.” In burning tears the Green-clad One cries:—

“ And this we must bear and put up with,
When I and my sister make music and dance.

‘ Tear away both his ears and his eyes,’ ”

screech all the Troll maidens. But the old King counsels restraint.

“ His sense is but human, remember.”

His Majesty proposes to perform a surgical operation on Peer as a means of correcting his vision. He produces a number of sharp instruments and tells Peer that when the operation is performed—

"merely a scratch on the left eye and the removal of the right one"
—he will see things as they are.

"Then you'll recognise that your bride is lovely,
And ne'er will your vision be troubled as now,
With bell-cows harping and sows that dance."

This is too much for Peer. His quarrel becomes acute. With a growing sense of danger his courage is stimulated. He defies the Troll King. And here a remarkable example of Ibsen's mysticism is presented. Unwilling to lose his hold on Peer the King insists that Peer shall marry the daughter. Peer refuses to recognise any obligation in the matter. The King exclaims:—

"What? Can you deny
That you lusted for her in heart and eye?"

With a snort of contempt Peer answers:—

"No more? Who the deuce cares a straw for that?"

And then the conversation proceeds:—

The Dovre King:

"It's ever the same with this human kind.
The spirit you're ready to own with your lips,
But in fact nothing counts that your fists cannot handle.
So you really think, then, that lust matters nought?
Wait; you shall soon have ocular proof of it."

Peer:

"You don't catch me with a bait of lies!"

The Green-clad One:

"My Peer, ere the year's out, you'll be a father."

Peer:

"Open doors! Let me go!"

The Dovre King:

"In a he-goat's skin
You shall have the brat after you."

The theory of the author appears to be that evil when cherished in the nature of a man gives an impetus to the creative forces of evil on the spiritual plane, and promotes, or indeed actually causes, the birth of forms—appearances—of evil on the plane of sense.

This truly is a doctrine of tremendous and far-reaching import, but a doctrine which is clearly anticipated in the writings of Swedenborg.

Yet another doctrine is suggested by the conversation above quoted and by the accompanying incidents. It is that the Troll Kingdom, which I have referred to as a kind of hell, exists for the reformation of the wicked. The strongest warning against Peer's course of life is presented by the Troll King himself when he makes the remark, half-question and half-comment:—

“So you really think, then, that lust matters nought?”

It is a revival of the better self of Peer—alas! only temporary, as we shall see,—which enables him to fight his way out of the Troll Kingdom. His chief opponent in the struggle is the Great Boyg, a person who, like many other imaginary characters of the play, is known to Norse legend and fairy story, and would no doubt be an early acquaintance of Peer when he heard children's stories at his mother's knee. The Great Boyg, as here presented, is not visible to Peer, though his retarding influence is felt. When challenged to give his name he replies repeatedly “Myself.” He is the type of the selfish nature. It is alone by our power to keep this “Great Boyg” in subjection that any of us can escape “the Troll Kingdom.” And here observe a significant feature of Ibsen's teaching. The counsel of selfishness always is to “go round” difficulties, to try and reach our goal by the avoidance of duties, not by facing and “going through” them. When Peer asks his way out of the Troll Kingdom the Great Boyg, anxious to keep him there, cries misleadingly, “Go round about, Peer.” But nerved for the time against the forces of evil, Peer replies, “No, through.” In his extremity he thinks of Solveig and conceives that she has power to help.

“If you'd save me now, lass, you must do it quick!
Gaze not adown so, lowly and bending—
Your prayer-book! Hurl it straight into his eyes!”

Peer sinks almost exhausted, but a sound of church bells and of psalm-singing is heard far away. The Boyg “shrinks up to nothing” and says in a gasp:—

“He was too strong. There were women behind him.”

Just as the author seems to hold that evil in men gives birth to forms—appearances—of evil on the plane of sense, he seems to hold that the prayers and kindly thoughts of others on our behalf have potential and actual value. If Peer has now escaped from the Troll

Kingdom it is because his strength and courage have been reinforced by the prayers of Solveig, and perhaps not less by those of his mother, Ase, who with all her weakness of character is strong in her affection for her son and in her faith that he will come out right in the long run. She little knows what a *very* long run it is to be.

It is not my aim, even if it were possible within the limits of a paper of this kind, to describe the whole story; but it may help to a better understanding of the features which I wish to emphasise, if in my analysis I follow the sequence of the main incidents of the plot. We may note that almost at every point the mystical quality and religious aim may be traced.

From the scenes in the Troll Kingdom we pass to a hut in the mountain, which wayward Peer has built in order to live the life of a hermit. But the faithful Solveig seeks him out. She inspires him with hopes of domestic happiness. Yet no sooner are these formed than the Green-clad One, a hideous she-demon, symbol of sensual pleasure, and her Ugly Brat, a hairy, misshapen offspring, typical of Consequences, and begotten from Peer's evil thoughts, rise before him. The hag warns Peer that even if he marries Solveig to-morrow she and the brat will haunt his home and claim to share in his love. As the uncanny pair trudge off to a thicket the brat flings a beer flagon at Peer.

The position of Peer now is painful in the extreme. The first thought which it suggests is that even when we have had the strength of will to free ourselves from the more threatening and injurious consequences of evil action—to escape from the Troll Kingdom—the memories of past sin will intrude themselves and mar our joys. And with this consideration comes another. It is not enough to fly from evil because of fear of the pains of evil. To secure happiness we must repent of evil and learn to love the good. Only thus can the old hags of evil thoughts and desires and the ugly brats to which they give birth be banished from our firesides—from the innermost places of our affection. Peer begins to see this.

“There's a text on repentance, unless I mistake.
But what? Where is it? I haven't the Book.
I've forgotten it mostly, and here there is none
That can guide me aright in the pathless wood.”

The wood is indeed to him pathless! And, just as when he was in the Troll Kingdom, Peer now considers the two ways—“the way through” and “the way round about.” But the circumstances are different. In reality the making of the present choice is harder. When faced by all the actual horrors of the Troll Kingdom he had been nerved to choose the right way—“the way through,”—and

had escaped. But now as he stands alone in the silent wood he has not the like impulse to strong action. It is a mental fight that he has to wage, a fight with his inner self. How it ends we know. Desiring spiritual peace, he is not willing to pay the price without which it cannot be purchased. He decides to "go round about." It is, again in keeping with his character that having come to this resolution he further decides that "he will proceed alone. Solveig might help him "to go right through," for that is the way of religious duty. But that is the path which he has not chosen, and pride and self-will, associated, it may be, with an underlying chivalry towards Solveig, hinder him from seeking her aid, even if now it were in her power to give aid at all.

The conclusions towards which Ibsen is leading us become more and more manifest as the poem proceeds, and when, many years having flitted by, we find Peer advanced from early manhood to middle age. He has travelled much, learnt much. His innate strength has in a worldly sense carried him far. We find him in Morocco, a prosperous merchant. But we soon discern that, morally speaking, his plan of "going round about" instead of "going through" has not answered. He stands on a lower plane than ever before. This is in the very nature of the case. When a man has known by experience the consequences of evil, when he has felt the need of repentance, but has, nevertheless, chosen the roundabout path—the path not of duty and self-sacrifice, but of ease and comfort, regarding his own happiness as the end of life—his last state is, inevitably, worse than the first. This is the case with Peer. As he has grown in years he has become more and more self-centred, heartless and worldly. He even pictures himself the coming Emperor of the World. Suddenly, however, he finds himself penniless and forsaken, marooned on the coast of Morocco by false friends, who run away with his yacht. When he wanders into the desert, encounters the sensuous Arab maiden, Anitra, and her dancing attendants, and sets himself up as a prophet, we see the logical development of the transcendently selfish nature of which he is here a type.

Not without purpose does Ibsen now lead Peer from the desert and robber-infested regions of Northern Africa, which correspond with the spiritual barrenness and supreme dishonesty of Peer, to Egypt, the land of old time tyrannies, the land which, above all others in human history, typifies selfishness enthroned. Where else have religion, science and culture been so entirely subordinate to the lust of power and made so completely to serve the ends of cruel rulers—of men who, at the cost of the life-blood of their people, could rear even pyramids as tombs? It is the desire of Peer to enter fully into the spirit of Egypt that Ibsen symbolises when he shows him in search of those mysteries which the statues

of Memnon and the Sphinx may be supposed to hide. But the climax is reached when Peer is inveigled into a mad-house and hailed by the lunatics as their sovereign, and when, to his horror, a wreath of straw is put on his head and the inmates unite in the cry: --

"Long life to selfhood's Kaiser."

But in this work of analysis we must hasten to a close. It will be remembered that in the final act, preceded by a vision of Solveig, now grown old, waiting in the cottage, Peer reappears off the coast of Norway, where his vessel is wrecked. We soon perceive that his disillusionment has really set in; he is ruminating on the emptiness of earthly joys.

In this scene we have one of those characters introduced which can hardly be accounted for excepting on the assumption that they are purely subjective—have no existence outside the overwrought brain of Peer himself, though they are presented with nothing to distinguish them from the other *dramatis personæ*. I refer to the character which is named by the author, "The Strange Passenger." He is at once the voice of conscience and a messenger of future doom. Note the reference to the escape which Peer, now long years ago, had from the Kingdom of the Trolls. Says the Strange Passenger:—

"Ay, have you gained but *once* in life
The victory that is given in dread?"

And note the further question:—

"Were then, the victory more likely
Beside your hearth-stone, snug and quiet?"

As I have shown, Peer has in the past striven to escape from the consequences of evil, but the love of evil, the willingness to do evil, have remained with him always; so long as he has been in a state of comfort, or a way of retreat has seemed open to him, the question of right and wrong has not in the least troubled him. At present he is in actual danger of being drowned! It is significant of the deep depravity into which he has sunk that even so it is alone of his bodily safety that he thinks. If his spiritual and better self and his higher intelligence for the moment stir in him, and in this new time of peril accost him as "The Strange Passenger," what of that? He will not listen.

"Avaunt thee, bugbear! Man, begone!
I will not die! I *must* ashore."

Well, the old proverb is true. We none of us die before our time. And Peer's time was not yet.

A festival is in progress when, unrecognised in his rags and wrinkles, Peer at last approaches his old home. The Dovrø King, in the form of an old man, again confronts him, and points out that, in spite of himself, he has lived his life according to the motto of the Trolls—"to thyself be enough."

"At the cross-roads" he meets the Button Moulder, who dooms him to the melting-pot, there to be re-minted. It is a bold device of the poet to bring the messenger of Judgment to Peer in the garb of a moulder of buttons. But the device is thoroughly consistent with Ibsen's method as I have already explained it, and with the whole spirit of the work. Not less than the other personages whom Peer has encountered, the Button Moulder has affinity to Peer's state and experience. In his childhood Peer had often amused himself by moulding buttons, and when a button was badly cast he threw it into the melting-pot again and moulded it anew. And what had he been throughout life but a bad button?

The strange figure, which comes to him with a box of tools, and a large casting ladle, says;—

Peer.

"I'm a button moulder. You're to go into my ladle."

What to do there? asks Peer. To be melted up, replies the Button Moulder.

"I have orders without delay
On Master's behalf to fetch your soul."

Peer protests. He does not want to be melted up. But the Button Moulder explains:—

"The custom's as old as the Snake's creation ;"

i.e., has existed since the beginning of evil.

"It's designed to prevent loss of good material.
You've worked at the craft—you must know that often
A casting turns out, to speak plainly, mere dross ;
The buttons, for instance, have sometimes no loop to them.
What did *you* do then?"

Peer answers quite frankly that he flung the rubbish away. The Button Moulder is not surprised. He reminds Peer that he comes of a wasteful family.

"Jon Gynt was well known for a waster,
 So long as he'd aught left in wallet or purse.
 But Master, you see, he is thrifty, he is;
 And that is why he's so well-to-do.
 He flings nothing away as entirely worthless
 That can be made use of as raw material.
 Now you were designed for a shining button
 On the vest of the world; but your loop gave way;
 So into the waste box you needs must go,
 And then, as they phrase it, be merged in the mass."

Into the theological bearing of these words it were perhaps best not to enquire. Whether they imply a belief on the part of Ibsen in a doctrine of universal restoration or in a doctrine of the salvation of the good and the annihilation of the wicked are matters which are arguable. I would not advise anyone to come to a conclusion hastily on this subject. The point of importance to note for the understanding of the poem is that Peer is thrown into a state of dread lest if he goes into the melting ladle and is "merged in the mass" with a view to there being another casting, he will no longer be Peer Gynt at all. He fears that whatever the process may involve ultimately, he will at any rate lose his individuality—that precious Self for which he has lived all along. He bitterly expostulates. Incidentally we have another reminder of the probable study of Swedenborg by Ibsen. Swedenborg tells us that the ascent of a soul into heaven or its descent into hell is determined by its state or quality. That, too, is the doctrine of the Button Moulder.

"You know that you are not airy enough for Heaven" he remarks to Peer. Peer resorts to all sorts of subterfuges. He says that he does not aim so high. He says that he is willing even to go to hell—for a time, say a hundred years—if only he is not deprived of one doit of his self-hood. But

"This casting-ladle business, this Gynt cessation,
 It stirs up my innermost soul to revolt!"

To this the Button Moulder promptly answers:—

"Bless me, my dear Peer, there is surely no need
 To get so wrought up about trifles like this.
 Yourself you have never been at all."

"Never myself"! Peer, in effect, exclaims. "Oh! the suggestion 'is too absurd.' It is true, none-the-less—true in the sense that he has 'set at defiance his life's design,' has never really lived his God-intended life—true in the sense which Christ had in view when he said 'For whosoever would save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it.' Peer, however, is intensely stubborn. He argues the matter most pertinaciously.

To analyse the scene in full would alone require many pages. It abounds in suggestion as to Ibsen's religious thought. The Button Moulder, paraphrasing the words of Christ, impresses on Peter that

"To be oneself one must slay oneself."

Moreover, it is our duty to let our light shine before men. The Master's intention in regard to us must be "displayed like a sign-board." And when Peer in self-defence pleads that a man may never come to know what the Master intended with him, the Button Moulder replies, "He must divine it." The suggestion underlying the passage is that the devil has no stauncher ally than want of perception, and that this want is always due to the absence of the desire to know the truth, and to disinclination to act in accordance with the truth so far as we know it.

Peer is brought to admit frankly that his life has been "damnable." He obtains assurance that if his repentance proves genuine he may even escape from the necessity of being put in the casting ladle at all. Then we have a scene which can only be paralleled in literature by that of Bunyan, wherein Christian is represented as running from the City of Destruction. On a heath, in the darkness of night, Peer is filled with an awful sense of isolation. A shooting star which flashes forth brightly and then is nought seems to bear a message to his soul of the brief earth-life of man. In a passionate longing for human and Divine sympathy he cries:—

"Is there no one, no one in all the turmoil,—
In the void no one, no one in Heaven?"

He realises that he is in the great hand of God, and that it is in patient resignation to the Divine will and in obedience that life should be lived. He has parted with his old egoistic self—the self that separated him from God and man,—and has found his true self—the God-intended self—by which he is united with God and his fellows and in the possession of which he may enter into all blessedness, Divine and human. When the Button Moulder again comes to Peer the proof of his repentance is unmistakable.

"Though your ladle were huge as a coffin,
It were too small, I tell you, for me and my sins."

We then pass to the last scene of all of the wonderful play—the scene in which the repentant but still perturbed and fearful Peer is welcomed by Solveig. In reality through all the long years the true self of Peer has lived in the faith, in the hope, and the love of Solveig. He feels that it is indeed to her that he owes his re-birth. Is it strange then that he hails her as mother as well as

wife? Spiritually she is both. As she reminds him that the Almighty Father has forgiven at the mother's prayer, he hides his face in her lap. The sun rises and a bright light spreads over the landscape and Solveig softly sings:—

"Sleep thou, dearest boy of mine!
I will cradle thee, I will watch thee.

"The boy has been sitting on his mother's lap.
They two have been playing all the life-day long.

"The boy has been resting at his mother's breast
All the life-day long. God's blessing on my joy!

"The boy has been lying close in to my heart
All the life-day long. He is weary now.

"Sleep thou! Dearest boy of mine!
I will cradle thee, I will watch thee."

Such is the story of "Peer Gynt." I said, at the outset, that it is the story of a man in search of himself, who works out the problem of existence first on the line of self-seeking and afterwards of self-surrender, and who accomplishes his end without definite help from the organised Christian Church. It may be suggested that these latter words require qualification—that Solveig herself is a type of the redemptive operation of the spirit of religion, and in some sense stands for the Church in relation to Peer. Equally it may be held that without the growth of religious ideas which the Church has helped to promote Ibsen could not have written this poem at all. I am quite prepared to accept these views, but will only point out that it is at any rate evident from this work that it was to religion in its more broad and universal aspects that the sympathy of Ibsen was directed. Here we see that this sympathy was deep and real. There is no ground for the charge sometimes brought that he is a poet of religious doubt. With ecclesiasticism and narrow dogmatism he was always ready to make war, but with Christ's message of Love he was in entire accord.

Ibsen's attitude towards religion pure and undefiled is clearly seen in "Peer Gynt." It is also seen in "Brand," which play, however, was written, as I have said, chiefly to condemn the peculiar view of self-surrender which a large section of the organised Christian Church has commended,—a view by virtue of which God's severity has been unduly magnified and his loving-kindness too little regarded. In the person of Brand, Ibsen presents for our special condemnation the Priest as Law-giver, though in the character of Einar (in Act V.), he gives us a type of the Priest as the Apostle of Faith

alone—of Faith without loving works; and in the Dean, he gives us a type of the priest as ecclesiastic and politician or statesman. In Agnes, just as in Solveig, we have the Church's Evangel of Love. Agnes might even be called a High Priestess of God's love. In this poem she almost alone points to the true ideal; in the study of her character we may get the best clue to the author's inner thought.

William Blake tells how God, having written the Tables of the Law, hid them behind His Mercy Seat. Ibsen's work is based on a similar thought. The law which is made to appear the law of a "jealous" God, the law which is made to appear harsh and vindictive and cruel, which seems to exact more than human nature can give, and to decree unending punishment for even partial failure, where there has been no possibility of complete success, is, from Ibsen's point of view, as it was from the point of view of Blake, a bad thing. The law, if it is to harmonise with our higher conceptions of the Divine Fatherhood, must be educative, regulative, redemptive.

In "Peer Gynt" the author has shown how all things make for good, not alone to those who love the Lord, but to the thankless and the evil. "Brand" emphasises the mischief of the contrary view. The leading personage in this play, Brand himself, has occasional intimations of the higher claims of the Universal Church, the Church based on the love of use to humanity. But the priest as law-giver is too often stubborn and obdurate. Brand never really yields to the promptings of his better angel in this respect. His rule of conduct is "All or nought," till the end. Hence the ultimate spiritual separation between Brand and Agnes, who at the first was drawn to Brand on the natural but mistaken assumption that a lofty and firm regard for law would be sure to include in it the finer virtues and graces.

Brand has been described as a type of the defeated idealist. But when our sympathy is invited for him on this ground we must remember the nature of his ideal, and consider whether it was true or false. The true idealist never is defeated. He may be crucified. But crucifixion is merely an incident in the progress of his ideal, and far from signifying defeat it may help the ideal forward. The fate of Brand was not to be defeated, but to fail. He could not do other than fail. The ideal which he pursued was doubly false. It was an ideal which did not rightly provide for men's spiritual needs and which ignored their material needs altogether.

The multitude readily responds to the call of the strong man, for it hopes to find in him a saviour, and is willing to believe in his power to save until it has experience of his impotence. Brand was a strong man, and the multitude at first listened to him eagerly. But what sustenance could they derive from the doctrine of "All or nought?" God is a God of Mercy. He does not exact more from

human nature than it is capable of giving. He weighs offences and does not measure them; he estimates the motives of our action and not the seeming largeness of our failure. He knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust. His law is *not* a law of "All or 'nought."

On the spiritual side Brand did not consider these things. On the material side, with a fanaticism that bordered on insanity, he was equally a bad leader. Whilst he called on the multitude to follow him to a new Land of Promise, he did not remember that even believers need to be fed, clothed and housed. When at the Sheriff's news that there are large shoals of fish in the bay the hungry people quickly forsake their leader, the situation is intensely ironical. But the irony is directed not against the multitude but against Brand. The moral of the episode is that a Church which does not care for the bodies as well as the souls of the people rests on a basis that is essentially unsound. Christ fed the multitude to whom he preached. It is true that man shall not live by bread alone. Yet he *must* live—by bread.

It is a striking feature of this play that the Sheriff, who is the author's type of the mere man of the world, sometimes in his own selfish and blundering fashion has a better sense of the actual needs of the people than has Brand. This is because the support of the people is necessary to him. He must consider "the majority." And "the majority" is dimly sensible of what is best, though often misguided and misled in the manner of seeking after it.

Difficult features of the symbolism of "Brand" are the hawk and the Ice Church. But no doubt they are connected with the dark, cruel, superstitious, cold and unsympathetic forms of religion which distinguish churches based on mere law and on Faith alone. The catastrophe of the play is brought about by the shooting of the hawk by the half-witted girl, Gerd, and the consequent atmospheric commotion in the snow-clad mountains which causes an avalanche. It is to be inferred that with the falling of the avalanche there toppled also the Ice Church, which was on "Blackfell top," at the foot of which Brand and Gerd were standing. Be that as it may, Brand is buried in an element which is typical of the quality of the religion to which his life was devoted. Gerd, who is the blind instrument of the disaster, is a type of those whom the Church has failed rightly to nurture. Observe that the rifle is said to have been loaded with silver. This is another remarkable example of Ibsen's imagery. I cannot now enlarge upon it, but will only point out that silver, according to Swedenborg's doctrine of correspondency, represents, under certain conditions, "spiritual good or truth from 'a celestial origin.'" It is by such good and such truth that the hawk and Ice Church, of whose destruction Ibsen's "Brand" is a poetic prophecy, must be destroyed in the world of realities.

"Brand" ends with the record that with the firing of the silver shot, and the descent of the avalanche of snow, a voice was heard crying through the thunder roar: "God is Love." That is Ibsen's final message in "Brand." It is the final message in "Peer Gynt." And so we close our study of these works, thankful that the world has not been left without prophets in these latter days, and thankful that the message which it needs has been vouchsafed in forms so glorious as in these two productions of the genius of Ibsen.

HENRY ROSE.

THE CARNEGIE TRUST FOR THE SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES.

THE Trust was constituted in the summer of 1901 by the gift of two millions sterling in the form of bonds of the American Steel Trust, paying five per cent. per annum. The administration of this princely gift was vested in a board of trustees, whose names commanded universal confidence. Half of the Fund was to be set apart for the payment in whole or in part of the fees of Scottish students at the Scottish Universities: the other half was to be devoted to general University purposes, such as the establishment of new chairs or lectureships, the provision of apparatus, the endowment of research, &c. What I have to say in this article is drawn, of course, from experience in the University in which I have been for the last 22 years, Aberdeen. While there is a general similarity in system and character between the four Universities, there are also differences. Some things that I mention may not apply to the other three, but where I know that such is the case, I hope to say so.

As to the purpose of one-half of the Trust Fund, the better equipment of the Universities, there has never been any question. The need was and is great. Glasgow and Edinburgh, which are situated in the wealthy regions of Scotland, and possess the call on a far richer population, had larger staffs of professors and lecturers, and offered (especially Edinburgh) instruction in a wider range of subjects; but no one could call them well equipped Universities. Their greatest advantage lay in the numbers of students attending them, and the larger annual income derived from the fees paid by students. This will be gathered from the following table, showing the number of students and the fees paid at the four Universities in the last year but one before the Trust was instituted: 1899—1900.*

* I get it from a Parliamentary return, obtained by the present Lord Advocate (who is one of the Trustees).

There is a considerable difference in the average fees paid by students. At St. Andrews there were hardly any medical students,

	Students.	Total Fees.	Average Fees per Student.
Aberdeen - -	828	£7,464	£9 (just over)
Edinburgh - -	2,833	27,291	£9 13s.
Glasgow - -	2,029	17,427	£8 11s.
St. Andrews - -	497	3,449	£7 (barely)

whose fees are far the largest. At Edinburgh there is a specially large proportion of medical students, and the Arts fees there were in several ways higher than elsewhere, and especially higher than they were in Aberdeen. The comparatively high average of fees paid in Aberdeen was due to the fact that here a considerable number of students attended more classes and took more teaching than was generally the case elsewhere. This is a subject on which more has to be said, and I shall return to it later.

As to this part of the Trust Fund, no question could arise except about the use of the money in detail and about the apportionment. On the whole, none will deny that the Trustees have performed a difficult duty well. It was not easy to settle which among the many serious needs was the most urgent, nor what should be the principle of division among four hungry Universities. Should one give most help to the poorest, or to the one which had most students, or to the one which was doing its work most vigorously; or should one make an equal division among all? Much might be said in favour of every one of these principles, and I shall therefore say nothing. The fact that in each University there are some who feel strongly that it received too little, and that most feel pleased that it got so much, is sufficient proof of the ability and judgment with which the Trustees performed this part of their duties.

Only as to the making of provision for Research, there is reason to remark that Research has been regarded too much as if it meant study carried on at a foreign University. It is undoubtedly an excellent way of spending money to give to promising, but insufficiently taught, students the opportunity of studying abroad to a higher level than the standard of instruction that has hitherto existed in the Scottish Universities. But why call this Research? The American term, "Post-graduate" study, is a hideous word, but is at least scientific and accurate in meaning. So far as I am aware (which is, of course, only to a limited extent), there has been extremely little Research done with this part of the Fund, but a great deal of useful Post-graduate study.

The provision made by the Trust for Research must prove disappointing in respect of the amount of such work done; it will certainly not seriously alter the very humble position of the Scottish Universities in the world of discovery, or make much difference in the amount of Research work done by them. Improved adaptations or translations of foreign books or collections of well-digested statistics do not constitute Research; but the work is educative to the doer and well worth doing. It will produce a certain number of scholars, and ultimately teachers, with a wider range of knowledge, better training and healthier ideas about scholarship, and thus public opinion will gradually be raised.

Here we have the real criminal. It is not the Trust that is most to blame because an endowment which the Trustees declare to be intended to promote Research is largely devoted to the completion of the education of half-taught students. The fault lies in the uninformed state of public opinion in Scotland with regard to education and Research alike. People complain that professors in our Universities do so little Research; but the very people that complain most are the first to criticise severely the action of any professor who tries to do any Research, or in any way diverge from the established rut of laborious inactivity.

But to return from this digression, there is a general agreement of opinion that one-half of the expenditure of the Trust has been, up to the present time, about as sensible and as beneficial as is possible in this imperfect world. There is no opening for discussion here, except to state individual opinion in regard to improving what every one acknowledges to be good—a task which I am not bold enough or foolish enough to attempt. But in regard to the other half of the Trust Fund, which was appropriated to paying, in whole or in part, the class fees of Scottish students, there is great conflict of opinion. At the first a storm of discontent and hostile criticism was directed against this part of the scheme: students would be demoralised and degraded by having their fees paid for them: the Universities would be crowded with unprepared and ignorant students: the standard of teaching would be lowered: the self-respect of the Scottish people would be ruined: and so on. I did not see any of the jeremiads with which (as I am told) the newspapers were filled, as I was abroad at the time. But even in the heart of Asiatic Turkey the faint echo of the din of this Battle of the Fees reached my ears.

My subject, then, is the fee-paying side of the Trust. That is what gives distinctive character to the Trust, and what every one thinks of when the Trust is mentioned.

It is difficult to compress into a single article a sketch of the bearing of this Fund on the development of the Universities, a defence of its idea against some of the attacks that have been made on it,

and a criticism of some sides of its practical working. It will conduce to clearness if I say at once that I have always admired the constructive policy which is embodied in the Trust, and praised the good principles on which it was administered for the first few years; but there has been recently a change which imperils its good effect.

To foresee the effect of a new principle in a University is not easy. The same rule, expressed in the same words, if introduced into two Universities of different character, spirit and traditions, may produce totally different results. Hence the extraordinary contrast between the anticipations and prophesies proclaimed respecting the Trust in 1901 and the actual facts as tested in a series of years.

It was declared by many that the Trust would flood the Universities with students to an extent that must overwhelm the teaching staff, and make the Universities unwieldy and unworkable. The Trust has brought to Aberdeen very few students who would not have come in any case. A professor of singular capacity for organisation and long experience said the same to me two years ago about his own University of Edinburgh. A marked increase in the number of students in Arts occurred here in 1905 and again in 1907; but this increase was almost entirely accounted for by the action of the Education Department, which is pouring its future teachers into the University in such numbers as to make the old system unworkable, and to call for serious changes and a considerable enlargement of the teaching staff.

Has, then, the Trust been of no good effect? Very far from it. It was doing a vast amount of good in the earlier years of its administration, under the liberal and enlightened rules which were at first put in force.

It will be granted by every one that it would be a very fallacious test of the good done by the Trust to measure it by the number of additional students whom it has attracted to college. It is not necessarily a right thing in itself to try to attract every one to Universities in which the system of education is in some respects so barren and so narrow as it is in the Scottish Universities.* Perhaps some, or even many, persons would do better to refrain from entering. For example, if Mr. Carnegie had gone to one of them, he would probably be now a professor, existing on his salary of a few hundreds, and raising himself from mere existence to the level of what may be called living by practising the non-professorial art of literature. It is a false method to begin by asking how many

*This was not the original character of the Universities. They used to give a sensible and useful elementary training in a well-chosen series of subjects, which was an excellent basis both for practical life and for higher scholarship; but they were not Universities in a real sense. The Commission of 1890 tried to hand over to the secondary schools the work done by the Universities, without doing anything to make the latter into real Universities. The result has been unsatisfactory.

students have been induced to attend the University by the prospect of attending classes free of expense. We shall take another way.

Another prophecy which was confidently made at its foundation was that the Fund, instituted by a donor who hated and despised classical study and everything ancient, would be so arranged as to injure classical learning. The only way in which it has injured Classics has been by forcing a considerable number of persons to acquire a profound hatred of the subject by compelling them, in order to qualify for the benefit of the Trust, to study Latin to a higher level than the Universities require. The Trust has been the main external support of Classics, in some ways that even the most thorough-going Classicist hardly approves. Of course, the true support of Classics is internal, the educational and real value of Latin and Greek.

It was also fancied that the Trust would aid the poorest students to enter the University. That has not been the case within my range of knowledge. On the contrary, friends who possess an intimate acquaintance with the North of Scotland tell me that the requirements of the Trust press most severely on the poorest country districts. They have least opportunity of benefiting by the secondary schools, and are hardest hit by the capricious and really difficult conditions of entrance. I know myself that the poor and aspiring student in the town, if he desires the higher education, as distinct from the M.A. degree, may get it in the University; but he must pay for it himself: the Trust has nothing for him. The ablest philosophic student in Scotland, if he cannot pass both in Higher Latin and a high mathematical test, must pay his own fees, if he wants to hear the lectures on his subject. Except in a small degree, the really poor student is excluded by the Trust. In this the Trust is in accordance with the times. It is, in my experience, becoming more and more difficult to cross the growing chasm that separates the poorer classes, the mass of the population, from the educated. That has been the tendency of the last forty years. Class prejudice has been greatly weakened from what I remember it when I was young; in that respect there has been an immense elevation in sentiment; and the prejudices of my childhood are now to me so unintelligible that I seem to have grown out of one nature into a totally different person. But the chasm between the uneducated and the educated classes is broader, deeper, harder by far to cross than it was. The Trust is not for the really poor student of the heroic type. The conditions are too narrow and fantastic. It has not in view those who seek education or knowledge; it has in view only those who seek the M.A. degree. It intensifies the tyranny of the examination system, and year by year relies more and more on mere examinations, while it increases enormously the already too serious penalty attaching to failure in any of the numerous examinations.

I am not now arguing that the Trust ought to have been directed to reach that class, to bridge that gulf, to widen the extent of education. While that would be a good purpose, there are other good purposes, and the Trust has sought other ends. I am merely pointing out how utterly fallacious were the first ideas entertained and expressed about the Trust. Nor am I arguing that the Trust ought not to have intensified and strengthened the hold of Classics by insisting on higher Classical requirements, especially in medicine, than the University demands. I simply point out how the facts have falsified the anticipation.

While the Trustees selected command universal respect, there is one remark that must be made; they had in general little acquaintance with the Scottish Universities, and it is doubtful how far they understood the practical effect of their own rules. It is probably due to this fact that the regulations affecting Arts students work often so unexpectedly. Two or three years ago, at the beginning of the summer, it was found that almost all our Honours students were excluded from the benefit of the Trust. A rule had been made that a Carnegie student must pass the Degree Examination in each class. Now, our Honours students never entered Pass examinations. The same practice exists in Oxford and Cambridge, and probably elsewhere. With rare exceptions, therefore, Honours students were refused, while Pass students had their fees paid: correspondence ensued, and the error was rectified by breaking the rule for that occasion. As the rule still exists, I altered my whole system in class examinations so as to save my Honours men from further inconvenience. Again, the Professor of English found at the beginning of winter in 1907 that fees for his class were refused to a large proportion of his students. The rule had been suddenly laid down by the Trust that no student should take English in his first year. One would have thought that English was a specially suitable subject to take in the first year, as a fundamental part of education; and it is the tradition in Aberdeen that English falls in that year. The rule dislocated the whole economy of the University, and would have necessitated a rearrangement of the whole order of classes for many students. Correspondence: remonstrance: the error was rectified by breaking the rule. Four or five years ago I found, after the class had begun, that the fees of my Optional Advanced Latin Class were refused; to the first students who approached me, I said that there must have been some slip, probably in the form of their application; but next day I was told that the refusal was general. Remonstrance: explanations: again the error was rectified. It was arranged after some time that in future the Advanced Class should not be paid for by the Trust. A later winter began: I warned my students that this optional class was not paid for by the Trust. Students came up at the end of the hour to inform me that I was mistaken, as they

had their fee granted. During the last two years the Advanced Latin Class has not been paid for by the Trust; but, as it still continues, numbering about 140 this winter, I was informed that it was contrary to the rules of the Trust that it should exist at all in any form or shape. I remonstrated, pointing out that this class had been instituted and worked by me, before the Trust had been dreamed of, as the only way open to me of keeping up the standard of work in my subject. I attributed mainly to it (so far as concerned the Latin part of the examination) the fact—remarkable and unique—that the Classical Ferguson Scholarship open to the four Scottish Universities had been gained for six successive years, 1902 to 1907, by Aberdeen students.

These are examples of needless interference with the teaching work of the University. I know that they proceeded from an eager desire to reform the University system—an excellent motive. An official of great weight in the working of the Trust said to me repeatedly, when I called on him at intervals, "I am trying to make the position unendurable for the Universities, in order to compel them to reform." Had this been said by one person alone, I would not quote it, but early in 1907 I mentioned it to one of the ablest, most influential and most universally respected among the Trustees, and he strongly defended it. It explains the recent action of the Trust, which otherwise is incomprehensible. Now reform is urgently necessary; but in the meantime, we professors must try to minimise the evils of the existing system, and I cannot share the view that the Trust should destroy all temporary devices for educating better the students of the present, in order that the students of the future may profit. Is the end and purpose of the Trust to aid the students of the moment, or is it an engine to reform in the future? Directly, of course, the Trust has no authority, but it has the power of the purse, and its recent policy seems directed to make it the ruler of the Universities. For the time being it is acting the part not of the ruler, but of the autocrat, capricious, incalculable, responsible to God alone.

Of the charges made against the fee-paying scheme, I propose to review those which have been heard most frequently. Some of them, I may say at once, have a certain apparent justification, due to the form in which the endowment was put in the deed of foundation. Others spring from pure ignorance. That the scheme has been put in the best form of which its idea is worthy I do not contend. That in the first few years of its action it was worked on such lines as to do a vast amount of good, with far less harm than any large sum disbursed by a board or an individual to large numbers of persons (so far as I know) has ever produced, I do contend. The harm produced in a few cases was small: the good effect in a large number of individual cases and in the whole working of Aberdeen University was enormous.

The first charge brought against the fee-paying side of the Carnegie Trust is that it is pauperising Scotland. This has a certain amount of apparent justification, due to the unfortunate form given to this provision in the scheme: it has no real justification. But, as this view has been widely held and does much to injure the good effect of the whole Carnegie scheme, it must be discussed at some length. As a practical working force this fee-paying provision differs little from the giving of a large number of bursaries (as the Scottish Universities call what in English are named "entrance scholarships"). There is some difference in theory and in outward show; but there is no deep-seated difference from the large class of bursaries in Scotland which are given by patrons on application, usually according to certain conditions of birth or of intention. The Carnegie Trust gives its benefits to persons of Scottish birth or descent. Now the general view is (and I share it) that these "private" bursaries have not done so much good in the University as those which are given by competition, and the freer the competition, the more beneficial have the bursaries been. I am not contending that the system of open competition is the best possible or conceivable way of giving such benefactions; but in practice it works more beneficially than any other way that has been tried among us, and opinion in Aberdeen is almost unanimous that the very life of our University has lain in the fact that the great majority of our bursaries have been given by absolutely untrammelled competition, open to all the world (except the sons of professors* in the University). Bursaries given by private patronage, though generally too restricted either by conditions of tenure or the too narrow outlook and range of knowledge of private patrons, have done good in meeting the needs of certain cases, which free competition was inadequate to meet. The Carnegie fee-paying benefaction was free from the narrower restrictions of the "private" bursaries: it was apportioned with an infinitely wider outlook than any ordinary private patron could exercise: it was, therefore, free from the defects of the "private" bursaries. I do not, however, argue that the greatest merit of the Carnegie benefaction lay in its being like a bursary, or that its advantages could be increased by assimilating it more entirely to a system of bursaries. Still less do I think that it would have been improved by introducing in any way the idea of competition or tests of comparative ability: we have quite enough of competition, as it is, in our Universities without adding any more. The intention in insisting on the general analogy between the Carnegie benefaction and the bursary is to show that the one has as little "pauperising" effect as the other. I have never known a case

* The open competition was formerly managed solely by the professors acting as a body, and was the great annual event of the educational world of north-eastern Scotland, and the test and stimulus of school management and teaching in that whole region; hence the exclusion of professors' sons was obviously a necessity of the situation.

—and never heard of anyone who had known a case—in which a bursary pauperised the holder of it. The whole University system of Scotland and England is founded on the system of bursaries or “entrance scholarships”; and practically every one is agreed, that there is nothing pauperising in that system. A friend who has had ample experience both of the English and the American Universities during thirty years has told me that in America, where a certain stigma attaches to the holding of benefactions akin in character to the “entrance scholarships” or bursaries, in Great Britain, there is a certain influence that may be called pauperising in such endowments. In Great Britain there is none. In Aberdeen I have during forty years known from time to time persons of long experience in University work who strongly discouraged the idea (which some people favour, and which has sometimes been carried into effect) that successful candidates for bursaries, who were able to go through their course without such aid, ought to resign the money in order that it might pass to more needy candidates. Their argument (with which I agree) was that this action—honourable and full of good feeling as it at first sight appears to be—was calculated to lower the standard of feeling among holders of bursaries and to cause a certain stigma of charity and “pauperisation” to attach to the accepting of a bursary. Those who are resolved not to hold a bursary or “entrance scholarship” ought not to enter as candidates for one. Even though they may believe that they are acting from zeal for the honour of their school, the act is liable to do more harm than it can do good; fortunately, the cases of this kind are everywhere few.

There has been some tendency to represent the Carnegie benefactions to individuals as charities or loans, which ought to be repaid. If this could be got into the minds of Scottish students generally, there would be either the beginning of a “pauperisation of Scotland” or a great diminution in the number of applicants. But they maintain, as a body, a healthy scepticism on the subject; and I trust this may last long. The Carnegie benefaction is in present conditions a good power, only in proportion as it is regarded in the light, not of a loan or a charity, but of an endowment increasing the benefit that the University offers to the student. The student who feels it as a charity feels dishonoured by his own thought; and to preach this doctrine to him, or to encourage the idea if he thinks of it, is a pernicious degradation of an excellent idea.

Moreover, this idea is founded on a totally erroneous conception of the reason for which fees are paid in the Universities. Those who entertain that idea seem to fancy that the fees are a payment made as the price of what the student receives. This is an erroneous conception of University work and University life. The fees are not the price of the instruction given. The price of an article must bear some relation to the cost of its production; but the University

fees do not even remotely approximate to the cost of what the University supplies. The fees are merely a way of meeting a small part of the working expenses of the University. The whole initial cost of the establishment was met, and a large part of the working expenses is met, by endowments and government grants. There have been through the ages many Carnegies on a humbler scale. Government grants have been made in the past and are still annually made. The fees are merely a way of providing part of the remuneration of the professors, who formerly did the whole of the teaching, and who still do the major part of it.

As to the original nature of fees with us, a deed of A.D. 1593 lays it down that pupils should show their gratitude to the professor by making contribution according to their means, from the great noble who pays three pounds, to the poor student who pays nothing; and this document leaves to the professor absolute power to determine the amount which each pupil shall pay. The idea that fees should vary according to rank lasted long*; though few would now desire to revive such class distinctions. But here, at least, the idea is clear that the pupils, according to their means, contribute to keep the teacher in a position to study and to teach: in other words, they contribute towards the working expenses of the University.

Every student who has ever attended a University class has been profiting from benefactions, as the Carnegie beneficiaries now profit. The only shadow of difference lies in two points: first, in other cases the benefactor is either a dead man or an impersonal entity, while this one donor is still living (though that is really a quite unessential feature, as Mr. Carnegie from the moment of the foundation ceased to have anything to do with the donation, which is vested absolutely in a board of trustees); secondly, whereas the Trust-deed (as I understand) gives power to pay all or part of the fees, the Trustees have chosen to pay the whole fees of each beneficiary. If the Trustees had chosen to pay only a part of the fees of students, the Carnegie beneficiaries would have stood in all essential features on the same ground, and would have been treated on exactly the same principles as the students of the pre-Carnegie days, profiting by the benefactions of donors to a very large extent, and paying a small part of the cost of what they receive as a mark of the "gratitude" which old deeds prescribe.

It might have been better if the Trust had broken with the old system more gradually, and begun by paying part of the fees. If the Fund is insufficient to pay the whole fees, as students increase in numbers, every consideration (except the trouble involved temporarily

* Anyone who studied in Aberdeen and kept his eyes open to the facts of life knew about cases of free classes, though these were kept secret: the student paid his fees publicly; it was a matter for the professor alone. This system ended necessarily in 1892, when fees were collected into a fund.

in changing the method) points out this as the way to meet the difficulty.

Before 1892 the fees of each class were assigned to the professor who was responsible for teaching it; and, when it was too varied in standard of knowledge and training, he sometimes paid assistants to do part of the work. In Aberdeen, where classes were not very large, and where the standard of previous training was fairly uniform, there was less need for such division of work; the students had, as a general rule, all experienced the same kind and amount of teaching at school, and differed only in respect of natural ability for particular subjects. Such differences are, of course, wide, but they are inseparable from human nature, and they do not render it impossible to lecture with profit to a large class in literature, though in mathematics they prevent a teacher from reaching the mind of all the students in a class of any size, unless he keeps on a level which is far too low for the abler mathematical minds in his class. I know from my own experience that, owing to my error in not taking a private tutorial class in mathematics in addition to the University teaching (as was at that time the almost universal practice), the lectures towards the end of both the junior and the senior class were quite above my comprehension, though I was advanced enough to gain the fourth prize in each class. But in literature a good lecturer will carry the whole of a large class with him from the first day to the last; all will learn from him throughout the course, according to their different capacities; all will profit by the class, and remember its stimulating effect on them throughout their lives; and yet their appearance in the class examinations will be of extraordinary diversity. Some pupils will make 20 per cent, some 90 per cent; some will be ploughed and some will take honours. The superficial examiner, who goes by mere marks, will declare that some of the pupils have gained nothing from the lectures; but years later you will find by chance occasionally that some backward pupil, whose examination was a warning and a heartbreak, had learned more than he or his examiners knew.

The old system then, that the fees went to the teacher, had a rational origin. So direct and intimate was the relation between the professor and his fees that in the other three Scottish Universities, as I understand, the professor himself received the payment from the students in attendance on his class; though in Aberdeen we employed an agent to collect fees, and paid him a percentage on all that he collected. To cure certain disadvantages of this system, the Royal Commission of 1890 modified it. It instituted a Fee Fund, fixed the salaries of the teachers, and devoted the Fee Fund primarily to the payment of those salaries, but ordered that the surplus of the Fund in each year, after the fixed salaries were paid, should pass to the General Fund of the University. Thus the Universities began for the first time to have a direct interest in the fees paid by

students; and a new era began, which is not properly understood by the public, and especially by that part of the public which knew the Universities as they were previous to 1890. There is still among them a wide-spread idea that the surplus of the Fee Fund is divided among the professors. Some of the public know better; but that idea is strongly fixed. A few months ago, in conversation with an official whose important duties bring him into close relation with the Universities, I found that he entertained this idea.

Now, whereas formerly an increase of the fees levied on students would not have been possible, inasmuch as only the professors would have profited thereby, under the new system the Universities generally have a direct interest in increasing the fees, and are under a strong temptation to raise them. Accordingly, during the last few years, the fees have been raised twice. On the first occasion, Aberdeen joined with Glasgow and St. Andrews in raising fees to the higher level which had always prevailed in Edinburgh. Soon after, Edinburgh resolved to raise its fees, and Glasgow and St. Andrews agreed to do the same simultaneously. Aberdeen refused at first to do so; but after a year it did as the other three had done. This, like all matters of finance, is under the control of the Court, a body consisting of fifteen members (four of whom are professors). The action was vehemently opposed and resented, and those who, during last summer, carried it through consented to it (as I am informed) very reluctantly. The sole justification for it was that the expense of running the University has been seriously increased by the large new buildings inaugurated in September, 1906; and without some new source of income, the Court had to face the prospect of bankruptcy. The reason why the Edinburgh Court first resolved to raise the fees was stated to be the desire to add to the teaching staff, a real and good reason.

These considerations show that the Courts of the four Universities had strong reasons for raising the fees. Yet it was a very regrettable step, and I confess that I agree with many of my colleagues who would have preferred to risk everything rather than raise the fees. But the temptation always exists, and will be yielded to in the future as it has been in the recent past; for the Universities are now controlled, not by the teaching body, but by business men, who in financial difficulty will not neglect the one easy source of revenue. The raising of the fees will always exercise the same fascination on the financial managers of the Universities that the Income-tax exercises on the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and the odium will fall, not on those who raise the fees, but on the professors.

It is evident from several different reasons that the effect of the Trust, if it were useful to the Universities, must be to increase largely the amount of fees: a student who seeks real and sufficient gain from the years spent at the University, must take more than the

bare minimum of teaching, *i.e.*, must pay more fees. He ought to take both higher teaching and more subjects: he ought to throw in classes of modern languages, one or more, not as a part of his seven subjects for degree, but as extras for the sake of enlarging his knowledge and his power of being useful in the world. From this point of view we see that the measure of the usefulness of the Trust was, in large measure, the amount of fees per student that it paid over to the University. If the students were zealous, enterprising, bent on knowing well their seven subjects, and learning more subjects besides the compulsory seven, they must take higher classes and more classes than the minimum. Long before the Trust came into existence, as soon as classes of French and German were instituted, I began to advise students to throw these languages into their course, not as part of their compulsory subjects, but as pure extras, treating the classes lightly and picking up from them what came easily. I do not know that any took my advice; but, at least, the advice is the test of my opinion. When the Trust came into existence I hoped that more would take the advice.

But what is the essential idea of the Trust? Is it a charity, or is it an educational endowment?

This question has not been clearly answered by the Trustees. Their method hangs between the two views. If it is a charity, and if they resent application from all who can by any means scrape together the minimum fees, it should be put in the application form that the applicant is in needy circumstances and cannot otherwise attend the University except under great hardship. This would cut down the number of applicants enormously, and no one would be justified in asking more than the bare minimum of fees, nor the Trustees in giving more. But, if they do not take this view, it is unfair and unreasonable to complain that students make large use of the Fund, and attend more classes than they would do if the Fund did not exist.

This charge needs some examination. We shall look at the purpose of the Trust from a wider point of view, which shows the fee-paying provision on a lofty plane of constructive legislation.

The fees in Scotland were a serious strain on the great majority of students; and in recent years the strain was especially great on students reading for honours in classics, and in general it pressed harder on all honours students than on pass students. In the old Scottish system there were no honours classes whatsoever, and the fees for pass and honours students were the same. But in recent years special honours classes were instituted. In classics most of our candidates for honours attended lectures for four years, winter and summer, and during the four years paid £19 in fees for Latin

and the same for Greek.* This was the case in Aberdeen: I understand that in the other Universities the students did not attend so many honours classes. There is no doubt that the expense of the honours course (which was much the greatest in classics) deterred several good scholars from seeking for honours. A pass student paid £3 3s. in Latin and the same in Greek, just one-sixth of the amount paid by many honours students. In Oxford, and I think in Cambridge, all students pay the same fee to the college, whether they be pass or honours students.

Apart from honours students, almost all others sought to get their degree with the minimum of expense and in the shortest time possible, viz., three years. Every additional class beyond the compulsory minimum meant an extra fee, and it was therefore impossible to expect that students would take either extra subjects or extra higher teaching in their compulsory seven subjects. The pass student took the minimum use out of the University because he wished to pay the minimum amount of fees. This was the difficulty which always confronted me in my attempts to raise the standard of work in Latin; and when, during the summer of 1901, in a chance newspaper which was allowed by the Turkish postal authorities to reach me in the centre of Asiatic Turkey, I read about the foundation of the Carnegie Trust for paying the fees of students, I said at once that here the means were offered of overcoming the difficulty. In October, 1901, when the University opened, I gave an introductory address to the entrance class, in which I pointed out that this new foundation would inaugurate a new era in the history of the University, and warned the new students that the standard of teaching and examination would rise steadily year by year, for students would be expected to come up to the level of the class teaching, and higher classes in every subject would gradually come into existence: finally pointing the moral that those who wished to pass easily ought to resolve to pass now, as every year would raise the level of the pass degree.

The fact is that under the system introduced by the Royal Commission of 1890, the amount of class attendance in Latin was reduced from 300 hours to 100 hours, while the standard of students entering was not raised a whit: hence the inevitable result was that the amount that was taught and learned in the pass class of Latin was greatly diminished, and the students were hardly raised beyond the level of school work when their attendance came to an end. The result was that they could not rise to the old level of the degree, and the numbers rejected were so great that in the year 1900 in despair I tried the experiment of instituting an advanced Latin class,

* I speak of the time before the class-fees were raised, and before we had lectures in Greek History, Roman History, Comparative Philology, &c. The cost is much greater now. This additional cost is nominally optional, but in practice a student cannot do his best without it.

a voluntary class intermediate between the pass and the honours classes. Without such higher classes the amount of good which students got from the University was being diminished; and the Royal Commission, which was intended to raise the level of education in the Universities, had with us this extraordinary effect, that it threw great difficulty in the way of students entering the University, and seriously diminished the amount that they learned after they entered. The Entrance Examination has always been a capricious, pedantic and incalculable test.* It exacts such a standard in four subjects as would ruin Oxford and Cambridge if applied there, by excluding almost all their pass students and a considerable number of their honours students. Yet it certainly has not raised the level of Latin among students entering, though it has excluded a certain number of the worst Latin scholars as well as a certain number of respectable Latin scholars who could not get up to the standard of mathematics, or French, or dynamics, or English, or Greek, and failed in one of their four subjects.†

The real and inestimably great service that the Carnegie Trust was for a time doing to University education was that it made the students who came to college study deeper and higher. Thus they profited far more by the time which they spent at college; and the standard of teaching and of knowledge was steadily rising—slowly, of course, but ten years of continuous slow progress would have made a marked difference without being felt as a hardship by the students of any one year. The fact that higher fees were paid for Aberdeen students by the Trust—for which we have been reviled and abused in almost every Scottish newspaper and private circle—is entirely to their credit, and to the credit of the Trust. It shows that the Trust was putting an immensely more thorough education within the reach of students, and that Aberdeen students in Arts were availing themselves of the advantage offered to them.

The unsophisticated scholar of other lands might have supposed that this was a merit and a proof of hard work and eager interest in study; but public opinion in Scotland judges differently; and it has the support of official documents issued by the Trust. The Scottish opinion is that this result is the climax of a career of unparalleled success in filching money from the Trust. It seems to be assumed almost universally that the object of students is to get fees from the Trust. They attend classes, with the possible penalty of having to repay the fees if their work is not up to the standard

* Many excellent students before 1890 could never have entered the University under the new system. A deserving and most satisfactory type of student of former days is now excluded.

† There is a way of entering the University after an imperfect Preliminary, and taking certain classes, with the uncompleted examination still pressing like a heavy stone on a swimmer; but a certain grim common-sense or caution prevents Aberdeen students (with few exceptions) from entering without a complete Preliminary. In the other three Universities I understand that hundreds of students enter with an imperfect Preliminary.

required, and they face the greatly increased amount of work involved in these classes, not from a laudable thirst for knowledge, but for the sake of pouring fees into the General Fund of the University.

This outcry is based on the theory that the Trust is a charity. If that is its nature, general opinion and the Trust are justified in condemning those who take more than the minimum of a charity. But, in that case, the Trust should act consistently and make it clear to intending applicants that they are asking charity, instead of allowing them to suppose that they are availing themselves of an endowment intended to benefit the nation and the Universities. The charity will be in itself a moderate good; but it will not do one-thousandth part of the service to education and to Scotland that the Trust was doing at first, when it was treated frankly as an endowment.

Under the influence of this outcry against the greed of students and Universities seeking to rob the Trust of fees to the largest extent possible, new rules were promulgated, and all the extra classes are excluded from the benefit of the Trust. Space forbids me from even trying to show what harm has been done by this disastrous change. It is causing a steady deterioration in the amount of higher education. It is killing higher classes by spreading among students and public the belief that it is a crime to take any higher or wider training. Since the Trust entered on its new policy I have had to lower my standard step by step. I could fight against the tendency to degeneration when there was no Trust. I could improve while the Trust was wisely administered. I cannot struggle against circumstances and the Trust combined.

The Trustees have failed to recognise one important side of their duty, the duty of being consistent in their policy. Their position has made them the arbiter of fate to many ambitious boys and girls; but one never can tell what change of policy may be sprung upon the country. The child may grow for years in confidence that a body of such responsible and experienced administrators may be relied on, and find that in one year the policy is changed. They announced at first that their action was tentative, and might be changed; but this is no defence: no man has a right to begin by acting wisely and then, in a panic, turn to unwisdom, on the ground that he did not promise to continue to act wisely.

There is one invidious and unfortunate feature which has marred the character of the Carnegie Trust, and which is largely responsible for perpetuating a certain odium against it. It discriminates according to birth in a peculiarly invidious way. The Trustees are not responsible for this. The sin is original, and lies in the Trust deed. Discrimination between students of Scottish and non-Scottish descent at the same University is a bad and hateful thing, an unworthy feature in a magnificent foundation. That is the sin.

which ought to be eliminated, or, if that be impossible, minimised. It affects Aberdeen very little, as 99 per cent. of our students are Scottish; and 75 per cent. apply to the Trust. It affects the other Universities much more.

The Trustees and their secretary are sincerely desirous of doing their work well, and of benefiting and developing the Universities. Their aims are excellent. They spend their labour ungrudgingly. But they are too much afraid of the future; and there has been a growing tendency to suspect everybody, and a resolve "not to be taken in," a spirit which is fruitful of evil now and in the future.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE RAISING OF LAZARUS.

THERE will doubtless be many readers of Professor Gwatkin's article on the "Raising of Lazarus" who will not have seen the passages in my book, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, about which the article is written. As it does not appear to me that Professor Gwatkin has really touched the special difficulties in this ancient problem which I desired to emphasise, I venture to quote one or two paragraphs from my book, that your readers may be in a better position to judge.

I said (p. 221): "The discrepancy between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic narrative, *i.e.*, S. Mark's Gospel, comes to a head in the story of the Raising of Lazarus. It is not a question of the improbability or impossibility of the miracle, but of the time and place and the effect upon outsiders. According to 'John,' Jesus had been in Jerusalem in the winter preceding the Crucifixion, and after that visit had gone away to where John the Baptist had been baptising. There He heard that Lazarus of Bethany, brother of Martha and Mary, was ill; and when at last Jesus comes to Bethany, Lazarus has been dead four days. Jesus goes to the tomb, accompanied by Martha and Mary and a 'multitude' of the Jews. He calls Lazarus from the tomb; and when he comes forth bound in his grave-clothes, Jesus says, 'Loose him, and let him go.' This stupendous miracle produces, according to 'John,' exactly the sensation that we should expect. Many of the Jews that witnessed the scene believed on Jesus, though some of them went away to the Pharisees and told the news. The chief priests and Pharisees hardened their hearts and decided forthwith that Jesus must be killed; but the common people were much impressed, and when Jesus (who had gone into the country, to 'Ephraim') returned to Bethany, they came to gaze on Him, and also upon Lazarus. To such an extent was this the case that the chief priests took counsel to put Lazarus to death also. This natural interest on the part of

"the crowds caused them to welcome Jesus with a triumphal entry; and stress is laid on the public character of the miracle and the many independent witnesses of it."

It should be pointed out that the direct opposite of Professor Gwatkin's new theory (that the fatal decision of the Sanhedrin was *not* a matter of common knowledge) is implied in John xi. 57.

It is this extreme notoriety of the Raising of Lazarus, not merely the consequent decision of the Sanhedrin, that makes the silence of Mark and Luke and Matthew so inexplicable to me, on the hypothesis that the story as told in the Fourth Gospel is historical. And I went on to ask where we are to put the scene into the historical framework preserved by S. Mark. I said (p. 222): "If the events occurred as told in the Fourth Gospel, if they were as public as the Fourth Evangelist insists, so fraught with influence upon the action both of friends and foes, they could not have been unknown to a well-informed personage like 'Mark,' nor could he have had any reason for suppressing a narrative at once so public and so edifying. It is true that 'Mark' does not record the Lord's Prayer or many of the most noteworthy sayings of Jesus, but these were not public events like the Raising of Lazarus. Is it possible that anyone who reads the continuous and detailed story of 'Mark' from the Transfiguration to the Entry into Jerusalem can interpolate into it the tale of Lazarus and the notable sensation which we are assured that it produced? Must not the answer be that 'Mark' is silent about the Raising of Lazarus because he did not know of it? And if he did not know of it, can we believe that, as a matter of fact, it ever occurred?"

Professor Gwatkin admits that "Mark ix. x. reads as if the events covered only a few days," but he goes on to assert "S. Mark neither says nor implies this; and there are several points where an interval might be supposed without contradicting him." I am not concerned to assert that these chapters cover "only a few days," or even to maintain that they provide us with material for reconstructing a complete itinerary of our Lord's movements during the period with which they deal. But unless they tell a wholly misleading story, they do describe the single momentous progress of Jesus from Cæsarea Philippi, in the north of Palestine, through Galilee southward to Jerusalem. It would be interesting to hear how Professor Gwatkin proposes to fit the story of Lazarus into these chapters.

F. C. BURKITT.

VIVISECTION AND DISEASE.

MR. Stephen Paget in his reply to my article on the Black Art of Vivisection* suggests that I am not in earnest in drawing public attention to the undoubted fact that the diseases to which the vivisectors have devoted their special attention have steadily become more fatal to mankind, while those that have escaped the care of the vivisector, and have been left to the ministrations of the kindly physician only, steadily decrease in fatality. I can assure him I am quite as serious as is the Registrar-General whose figures I have quoted.

Mr. Stephen Paget has discovered two little mistakes in my article. In the case of anthrax and glanders I quoted the actual deaths that occurred in England and Wales during the periods under review, though in the letterpress I alluded to the figures given as the death-rate per million persons living. This little mistake probably arose from the fact that I dictated the article, and that the shorthand writer put in the words "per million persons living" because in all the other cases these words occurred, and in looking over the extended typewritten copy I did not observe the error; but it in no way invalidates the argument I was advancing in the case of anthrax, for the actual deaths have gone up from 9 to 17 between the first quinquennial period, 1886-1890, and the last quinquennial period, 1901-1905, and, therefore, it is manifest that the death-rate per million persons living has largely increased, for the population has not doubled in that interval. The figures for the death-rate per million persons living, though not given by the Registrar-General in decimals when they do not reach 1, can be arrived at thus:—

Period.	Average Number of Deaths.	Population.	Average per million.
1st quin. period 1886—1890 ...	9 ...	28,139,682, say 28 millions ...	.321
2nd " " 1891—1895 ...	7.8 ...	29,764,756, say 30 millions ...	.260
3rd " " 1896—1900 ...	15.2 ...	31,521,876, say 32 millions ...	.475
4th " " 1901—1905 ...	17.4 ...	33,382,727, say 33 millions ...	.527

* "Experiments on Animals," CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, May, 1908.

This shows a marked rise in the death-rate, and if Mr. Paget is correct in stating that the treatment discovered from vivisection has proved beneficial to sheep and cattle he does not explain or make any attempt to explain why a treatment valuable for sheep is of no service to mankind when afflicted by the same disease.

DIABETES.

Here Mr. Paget makes no attempt to explain the undoubted fact that contemporaneously with the application of treatment based upon vivisection the death-rate per million persons living has gone up.

DIPHTHERIA.

Mr. Paget very kindly quotes my words to the following effect: "The highest death-rate ever recorded took place in the five years from 1896 to 1900, which synchronises with the spread all over England of the antitoxin treatment." He does not traverse that statement in any way, but he gives us a table of case mortality from the report of the Metropolitan Asylums Board of 1904. I am not prepared to accept tables of case mortality for diphtheria as invalidating in any way the sinister import of the Registrar-General's death-rates. There is nothing to prevent persons being treated with antitoxin who are only suspected of having diphtheria, and if that be done case mortality figures may be made to seem to prove anything. At one time we know from the evidence of Dr. Taylor before the Royal Commission, Q. 5,744, that at Guy's Hospital cases were systematically injected with antitoxin even if there was only a suspicion of the patient being infected with diphtheria, and what happened at one time at Guy's may happen elsewhere. The impartial are not, therefore, called upon to accept these tables of case mortality as of greater weight than the death-rates recorded at Somerset House. Mr. Paget takes leave of the question of diphtheria with the following sentence: "Umbrellas do not prevent wet weather, nor do fire-escapes prevent houses from catching fire. Mr. Coleridge's argument against diphtheria antitoxin is 'equally valid against umbrellas and fire escapes.'" But, unfortunately for this simile, the umbrella recommended by Mr. Paget is in the nature of a funnel which collects rain and projects it upon the person who carries it, and those who venture abroad with his serum umbrella get a worse ducking than those who carry no umbrella at all, according to the Registrar-General's figures. So with fire-escapes, if you use Mr. Paget's serum fire-escape it is manifest from the Registrar-General's figures that you are more likely to break your neck and die from the fall from the burning house than

if you project yourself into the flower-bed without the assistance of the serum fire escape. Therefore Mr. Paget will do well to leave his umbrella and fire escape behind in future arguments with me.

TETANUS.

Mr. Paget does not dispute my figures, which show that the death-rate has gone up from 1.8 to 6.2 in the interval between the first quinquennial period and the last which I quoted in my article. Against this ominous fact, which cannot be disputed, he cites, without giving any reference, figures fifty years old of the American Civil War in another continent, and figures from the Franco-German War thirty years ago, also without any reference. It is now my turn in these circumstances to question whether Mr. Stephen Paget can be very serious in setting up these hazy and remote statistics with no references as valid arguments against the Registrar-General's figures for England and Wales.

DISEASES OF THE THYROID BODY.

As he cannot traverse the figures I give, Mr. Paget seems to suggest that the death-rate may have gone up because the Registrar-General includes under this heading "diverse forms of malignant diseases." If this were really so I imagine that the Registrar-General would have made a further classification. Until he does so I do not think I am called upon to answer this suggestion.

ATROPHY AND DEBILITY.

Here Mr. Paget does not deny my two assertions: first, that the death-rate has gone down; secondly, that this is not due to any invention of the vivisectors; but it is to be remarked that he declines to give any credit for this fall of the death-rate to those whom I have called the "kindly physicians."

CONSUMPTION.

The serum treatment invented by the vivisectors having proved a fiasco and the open-air treatment proved a success, Mr. Paget endeavours to claim for the vivisectors the credit of the latter treatment. He says that the vivisectors discovered that consumption was a contagious disease, and without any possible link he assumes, as a deduction from that, that the open-air treatment comes to us from the hands of the vivisectors. My reply is that the discovery that consumption is a contagious disease, and the discovery of the open-air treatment, have nothing whatever to do with each other.

CONVULSIONS.

Mr. Paget suggests that the reason why the death-rate from this disease (or as it appears he would prefer me to call it "these diseases") has fallen is owing to physicians in former times having certified that infants died of convulsions who really died of something else. It seems that, in his opinion, the thirty thousand physicians who are not vivisectors are all silly persons, and that knowledge is the exclusive possession of the vivisectors.

DROPSY.

He assigns the fall in the death-rate here also to the silliness of physicians in former times.

DYSENTERY.

Mr. Paget refers me to Mr. C. J. Martin's evidence before the Royal Commission to show that the absence of a rise in the death-rate from this disease is due to the labours of the vivisectors; but, unfortunately for this theory, Mr. Martin does not suggest in his evidence that the serum invented by a foreign gentleman of the name of Shiga has been used in England and Wales. Therefore my suggestion remains untouched that a malignant ascent in the death-rate from this disease has probably been avoided by the absence of any serum treatment based upon vivisection.

INFLUENZA.

Here Mr. Paget has discovered that a departure from the quinquennial periods into which I have divided the death-rate from all the diseases impartially, and the selection of some other periods for consideration, may be made to show that the death-rate has been going up and down, instead of gradually falling since its first arrival in recent times in this country. This, of course, is quite an unfair method of argument. I am referred to Wurtemberg, Hungary, and Japan, but I am altogether unimpressed by tables compiled by vivisectors on their own exploits, and the reference to Sir Victor Horsley's evidence seems to show that Mr. Paget had not, at the period of writing the article, perused my fourth day's evidence before the Royal Commission in which I answered Sir Victor Horsley. I observe that Mr. Paget excuses himself on the ground of want of room from making any attempt to answer my contentions in the matter of measles, meningitis, scarlet fever, typhoid and whooping cough.

APPENDICITIS.

Here, Mr. Paget says, "I need not give the figures." My answer is, as a matter of fact he cannot give the figures because, unfortunately for his contention, the Registrar-General has not thought fit to classify appendicitis by itself; he deals with enteritis, gastro-enteritis, perityphlitis and appendicitis.

ALCOHOLISM.

Mr. Paget says here the death-rate has gone up and the disease has been left to "the ministrations of the kindly physician." I refer him to Q. 15,866, in Sir Victor Horsley's evidence before the Royal Commission as follows:—

15866. Just to take one drug, as an example, about which you have spoken and written very strongly—alcohol—have there not been many experiments performed upon animals, to say nothing of experiments that man has performed upon himself—Yes, a great many.

The death-rate per million persons living for five quinquennial periods from alcoholism is as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	56
2nd "	" 1891—1895	...	...	56.5
3rd "	" 1896—1900	...	...	85.8
4th "	" 1901—1905	...	...	78.2

but perhaps both Mr. Paget and myself may agree that the deaths from this disease, if investigated with care, might be found to fluctuate with the rise and fall of the labour market, and to be independent of either the kindly physician or the vivisector.

PREMATURE BIRTH.

Mr. Paget says the death-rate has gone up swiftly. The quinquennial figures are as follows:—

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	507.2
2nd "	" 1891—1895	...	...	561.8
3rd "	" 1896—1900	...	...	574
4th "	" 1901—1905	...	...	569

from which it is manifest that certainly during the last fifteen years the rate has remained about the same, the average being 568. No fair-minded person will say that this death-rate has gone up swiftly.

CANCER.

Mr. Paget has kept cancer for the last paragraph of his article. He does not dispute my two statements (1) that a vast welter of misery has been inflicted upon animals in the cancer research laboratories of this country, (2) that the death-rate has gone steadily up, but he professes to believe that I am only joking when I express

my own opinion that one of the results of the multitude of vivisections is to weaken the faith of the kindly physician in time-tried melioratives, and that this may result in the aggravation of the malignity of this malady. I can assure him I see nothing humorous in the ghastly failure of vivisection in respect to cancer, but I think I may invite him to join me in indulging in a happy smile by the consideration of the fact that the struggles of children with their teeth have by great good fortune been watched with indifference by the vivisectors, and that the following pleasing results are shown in the death-rates for the last twenty years:—

•

TEETHING.

1st quinquennial period	1886—1890	...	...	158
2nd	"	1891—1895	...	139
3rd	"	1896—1900	...	114
4th	"	1901—1905	...	90

•

STEPHEN COLERIDGE.

(

PRESENCE AND OMNIPRESENCE.

A CHRISTIAN STUDY AIDED BY THE PHILOSOPHY OF MONSIEUR BERGSON.

GOD is known to us, and experienced by us, as the self-communicating God. He does not merely give us life, He gives us His life to become ours; He does not merely teach us to love, He infuses into us the activity of His own love. And this is the mysterious process of the deification of man. It is a real process, affecting every element, faculty, character, quality, part in men; it is a process in which they are really one together, and one in and with God; not, indeed, by confusion of substance, nor by absorption of person, but by permeation and interpenetration of Spirit and Life. Such is our Christian belief.

We are apprehending the manner of this process, intellectually, after our usual fashion. We apprehend it, not as a growing whole as it really is and occurs in our own experience, but as a part here and a part there; sometimes in relation to one so-called faculty, which, for the convenience of our intelligence, we have dissected out, in words and by reflection, from the living continuity of a man; sometimes in relation to another. We say, for example, that God has given to each one of us a spark, as the mystics call it, of that divine freedom which in Him is perfect liberty. We know that in us this freedom is as yet unrealised except as a small beginning. We see that the spark is burning but feebly, although it never ceases to burn; and we regard it as only an earnest of what is to come, when it has grown with our psychical growth, strengthened with our personal strength. We turn all this over in our reflection, and then we give a name to it, as if it were not an aspect of our process, but a power by itself. The mystics symbolise it as a spark; we fix it intellectually as a faculty or permanent endowment, and call it free will. The word betrays at once the abstractive, isolating, *solidifying* habit of our intelligence. This habit is what enables us to think of a will as something by itself, a separate power, and makes us lose sight of the enduring, ever-newly-becoming being, who wills, and works, and feels, and thinks, in a perpetual but always changing wholeness of life. It is a statical or solidifying trick of ours, which enables us to give

fixed shape and definite outline even to our own flowing cumulative and creative life, and to name its parts as though it were a nest of Chinese boxes, body outside, mind next, soul the little pill-box thing in the middle, and each one cut up in neat patterns, rings and squares, and lumps and hollows.

Somehow or other we must shake off this way of the intellect, when we are dealing with truth of real concrete life. It has grown upon us because our intelligence works in a way to help us in the struggle to master and use the material world. There it suits us, and gives us control, because it divides up the continuity of that world into separated objects in space, according to the needs of our practical interest. But when we turn round upon ourselves, as we are in our totality of relations, it misleads us badly; and if we can, we must try to learn new ways. Let us try to remember that nothing in ourselves is isolated, or fixed and stationary, as we imagine material things to be; and that there is no such thing as a will or any other faculty in a man. Let us try to think that there is only the man, growing, changing, thinking, feeling, willing, creating himself anew in ever new relations and flow of life. When we fix our attention on one phase or aspect of his wholeness we are not discovering a faculty, we are looking upon something which we can isolate only in thought and language, not in fact and truth of human life. If we succeed in remembering all this, then, when we begin to discuss a man's relation with God, we shall be better able to see that if he is, as whole man, in the way to the fulfilment of his destiny, he is being deified as whole man, although finite man, and not in bits. All his functions and relations, all his powers and possibilities, which we name as apart one from another, are being gradually made to include more and more the unified, co-ordinated functions and relations and powers of the Infinite God. Man wholly is being changed, and is changing himself, in God.

It is our finite participation in that aspect of the life of Infinite God which we call His Omnipresence, that I want to discuss—a participation which alone makes both possible and actual the Communion of Saints and the universality of Christ.

Let us consider first what we mean, and more particularly what we do not mean, when we speak of God as omnipresent. We certainly do not mean that He is universally diffused throughout space as we know it; diffused like, or perhaps with, the universal ether in which, in a sense, we live and move and have our being. St. Augustine could think this before he became a Christian, but not afterwards; and no other Christian can think it consistently with Christian belief in general. The ether is in a sense omnipresent, by itself or by its modifications; that is, some ether is to be found everywhere; but its omnipresence is something quite different from that which we attribute to God. What is this difference? It

is not a mere question of the fact of action and power. The ether, modified and unmodified, is supposed to be active and charged with enormous power. Why *may* I not think of it as God? Why do I not *want* to think of it as God, and am, indeed, repelled by the mere thought of doing so? The reason is plain; it is because the ubiquity and power of a physical thing are impressive only as the size of a physical thing may be impressive. They may captivate the intelligence, they may arouse admiration; but they have no living warmth, no real significance for the depths of personal life. They are affairs of the intelligence and of bodily action; they bring no perpetual newness of personal and reciprocal relations. If God were omnipresent only as the ether is omnipresent He would be uninteresting to us, except as a matter for study and for utility in outward practical business. He would be as uninteresting, although as interesting, as the physical universe if it is taken as merely physical.

But our friends stand in a different relation to us, as does every human being. The presence and potency of our friends is not merely physical, even in superficial appearance. And when we think about them and about ourselves we are forced, it may be by slow degrees, but we certainly are forced at last, to speak of them as spiritual, and of their presence as effective with us in a manner that we must call psychological, or spiritual, or both. So it is when we begin to discuss God. He, too, must be called spiritual; His presence and potency, also, must be called psychological, or spiritual, or both.

So I propose to discuss, as at least allied together, our own capability of presence and the omnipresence of God. The one may be truly shown, however dimly and partially, in the other.

How, let us ask, are things present to us? As soon as we put this question we see that we are not cramped in mechanical relations and a world of necessity; we recognise the fact that as we turn to them in thought the stars we have seen are still present to us, and stars, too, that we have not seen; we notice that our friends are made present, even when they are far away, perhaps parted from us by the thickness (or is it thinness?) of a material world. There is something very remarkable about the presence of things as we constitute it to ourselves. It may be said, perhaps, that these manners of presence are only memories of the past, or imaginative anticipations of a future. Well, and if they are, what of that? Are they without significance? Do they not show that in a certain way we are extended into the past and towards the future, that our duration holds us and our gift of presence, and our things and persons, as a permanent possession? When we choose out, in memory or anticipation, some thing, or event, or person, the image of it or him is discovered in our enduring life-process; it is a real part of it, as thus remembered or anticipated. We fix our attention on one or on another, and we discover it to be ours, present to us, integral with us, interior to our living grasp. We

can picture to ourselves so great an extension of the employment of this power as to enable us to embrace consciously, as present, anything we have ever experienced, and anything else that our experience could possibly enable us to imagine. All this wonder may take place while we sit in an arm-chair before the fire; and we may be outwardly passive while it is going on. We are inwardly active, it is true; but there is something that must be noticed about this inward activity—the fact that it is, to all appearance, wholly inward, and spent on change in ourselves. It seems quite different from the activity which, when we are talking with a friend, makes him present to us and operative in us, and makes us present to, and operative in, his mind and its operations. This kind of presence is not only, as we say, an affair of memory or of anticipation. And I think it is the kind to which many of us are inclined to limit the use of the word presence.

The limitation is, I venture to say, one of our confusing mistakes, and it is due, like many others, to a desire for short cuts and easy thinking. We limit the use of the word life to the most lively-looking things; we limit the use of the word prayer to our most conspicuously prayerful acts; we limit the use of the word body to the grossest appearance it presents; and all these limitings mean short cuts and easy thinking—short cuts that lead into blind alleys, easy thinking that does not lead to the best truth we are able to receive. I would plead for a different method of travelling and considering, and I want to discuss now in that different way the operation and process that we call *presence*.

It will be admitted by every one, of course, that my friend is present to me when he is sitting in the opposite arm-chair, and that I am present to him. Now why, or rather how, am I present to him? He *hears* me, and takes in something of me in what I say. Well, if I went into the next room and spoke through a speaking-tube he would hear me. Should I be present to him? If I went to Croydon, and spoke to him in London by means of the telephone, he would hear me. If I were in Paris he might hear me. With a suitable apparatus it is conceivable that he might hear me and make my mind his, from the Dog-Star. Obviously, hearing takes us far in regard to an effectively working presence. Then shall we consider the limiting claims of sight. He sees me and I see him. But such a trifle as my taking off my spectacles—I am myopic to a high degree—will stop my seeing him. And a considerable distance in open country would not stop it if I had a telescope and he were within its range. Some kind of instrumental extension may some day enable us to see the engineers in Mars clearing out a blocked canal. Sight, then, is not entirely satisfactory as a limiting means, in respect of presence that may be effective for the communication of mind to mind. Nor is touch—we are certainly present to each other without touching. Then shall we say that we are present to each other when by means of

any sense, and any extension of it, we enter into relations of which we are conscious?

This sounds better, but I am afraid it does not go far enough. There is the fact of telepathic intercourse and influence to be reckoned with. The definition of this is "Communication of mind with mind "otherwise than through the recognised organs of sense"; and it takes place without regard, apparently, to what we call spatial conditions. There is a large and weighty amount of evidence to show that human beings communicate one with another under every kind of spatial condition, without sensory assistance, and even that they communicate without intending it, and receive communications without knowing that they do, and without consciously taking immediate possession of them. It seems to me that if I extend the use of the word presence to include the process of speaking and hearing through a telephone, and seeing through a telescope, I am laying stress chiefly on the *fact* of mental communication, not on the *manner* of it. Therefore I must speak of a person as present to me if he communicates an idea, or affects me emotionally, by the underground—subliminal—process we call telepathic. I do not see a way out of this. It is the fact of communication that is essential for this operative presence, not the manner of it. And now I see myself forced to go even beyond telepathy, and to say that when I receive a letter I discover the presence and assimilate the mind of its writer. When I read a book, when I look at the Pyramids, I discover their authors as present to me in some degree and fashion, communicating with me, bestowing upon me something of themselves, binding me in one way or another to themselves—as all communication binds one person with another—and thus making their lives and mine, in a measure, however small, at one.

Obviously, or at least obviously to me, I am not altogether checked in my communication with other men and in my reception of their gifts, by distance in space or time or by the limitations of sense; and I can easily picture to myself that under other conditions of sense and of spatial and temporal relations such hindrance as exists might disappear entirely; and I might find myself in communication at will, or even otherwise, with any being anywhere. My life might contain gifts of any one of them. Should I, then, be omnipresent as God is? Have I no limitations other than those of space and time and sense? Has effective presence, that is, the presence which is permeation and communication and bestowal, no other conditions in me?

Here we come to the most important point in our discussion. All operation of communication in me, if it is to be effective for me, all my personal growth in active reciprocal union with the general body to which I belong, is conditioned by my *interest* and my *attention*. I receive, to be effective in me and for me as active and personal, no attempted communication to which I do not, in some way,

either subliminally or otherwise, *attend*. I do not select and recognise as present to me, and so build up into the real structure of my personally owned life, any thing, or idea, or person to which, or to whom, I do not attend. And I am so constituted as to be unable to be interested in, or to attend to, everything at once; indeed, I cannot effectively attend at all, except in a very closely narrow area. Yet I cannot even hear or see consciously without attending, although my attention may come after an interval of time from the occurrence of the stimulus; as in a case, for example, when my attention has been occupied by something else. I am writing, let us say, and I do not hear somebody who is speaking to me. After a minute or so I stop writing, and suddenly I find my attention fixed upon a remark that I had not heard when it was made. I consider the meaning of words that are gone by for bodily sense, but are only now become present to me in my conscious awareness. The remark becomes effective in me as soon as I attend to it, but not before; and I attend to it, not as and when the sound-waves strike upon my ear, but while an echo of them is, as it were, ringing in *me, myself*, going on in my "psychical" experience some time after the "physical" sound-waves of the air struck my tympanic membrane. Take, again, a larger matter. Love, the heart of psychical life, is effective only through attention. My love may be, in intention and in my purpose, general; but it is effective only as, and when, and for him to whom, I attend. The extension of my deepest life is above all an extension of my love; but it implicates an extended range of attention. Only as I attend to others do they really become my own, sharing my life, integral with it, and transforming it. And although this wholeness of extension is the way of destiny for me if I am to fulfil the possibilities of a growing, expanding, free life-process, I am always faced by the fact that I cannot stretch my attention beyond a narrow field at one and the same time and operation. I have to pass from field to field, neglecting one, for the occasion, in order to reach another. With all the goodwill in the world, I must move from this to that. I can never, at the same time, include in my attention every this and every that; and my capability of being changed in my real self and character by effective presence, effective reception, effective mutual permeation of psychical life with my fellows, is measured at any given time by the limits of my effective attention. If it were not so, there would be no security for my personal freedom. I might be invaded and conquered: I might be annexed as a psychic slave.

For God there is no such danger; but nevertheless His presence and His effective working in spiritual permeation are allied, so we think, with His attention. And His attention is infinite. He is effectively present in every relation everywhere in every moment of time. He embraces every this and that effectively together, and yet embraces each one as though it were the only one. This is what we understand

by His Omnipresence. In God Himself there is no obstacle, no check to universal presence and efficacy, as there is in us.

I think of His presence to me, and of my presence to Him (as I must) in terms of my own spiritual life, not in terms of the intelligently constructed, but unreal, space-occupying, mechanical-seeming world. He is present to me as I attend to Him; but I am present to Him always, everywhere, under all conditions and relations, in all modes of my activity, because He attends to me as though there were nothing else to be attended to in the whole universe that He loves. He proffers Himself to men in all possible manners of His relation with them, indirect or direct, in that intimacy of presence and communication of life which overpasses anything possible between man and man, overpasses even the telepathic presence of man with man, which, if it were unhindered, would teach us better than anything else what is meant by the permeation of Spirit by Spirit. It seems that wherever Spirit attends, Spirit extends. That is our experience. And because God attends everywhere and to all, He extends everywhere and in all. His interest is without measure, His Love is without measure; so He Himself in His fulness is present everywhere, to the least and meanest of His creatures, in the measure of their capacity; and to Him they are present always, and wholly, and in every need.

We begin to see how utterly different physical extension is from spiritual, and how utterly different the relation between Spirits is from the relation between material or substantial things as we picture it and them to ourselves. Not logic, with its principle of exclusion, not our conception of material objects in space, each outside the other, juxtaposed, or displacing, or contiguous with one another, can bring home to us the principle of the mutual relations of Spirit with Spirit, man with man, and, pre-eminently, man with God. Nothing but our own experience can show it to us; and our own experience does show it to us. Grade by grade, in the depths of our personal life, we find a developing clue to the manner of the love of God as He communicates Himself to His creatures. Through our experience we discover that the gift of self is the gain of self, that personal life grows by communication, intensifies and strengthens as it receives and gives. We see that when God bestows Himself upon His creatures He becomes truly their own, as they become His, and that the rush and power of His life does not displace theirs, but passes into theirs and is taken up in a real ownership by themselves when they have given themselves to Him.

The interpenetration of Spirit by Spirit is a vital process; and the ways of our thought in relation to what we call substance and mechanism are not even analogous with it. It is the process by which we ourselves feel and are felt, work and are worked upon; and God and man are together engaged in it. But it is emphatically a *process*; and we, engaged in it, are not fixed points or isolated bodies,

such as our intelligence, our practical interest and our attention carve out of the continuity of the world by means of sense-perception and language. On the contrary, we are continuous *becoming*, always becoming, and always enduring. We do not pass away as we change and become; our personal becoming is throughout consistent with itself; we roll up life into ourselves, make it our own life, from birth and beyond to death and also beyond; we roll up a growing snowball of enduring, creative, absorbing life. Every moment of our life is a new creation from within, a creation in which the universal life becomes more and more our own, stamped with our stamp, unique as each one of us is unique; and every moment of it is continuous with every other in our whole duration. But we are not only a continuous creative becoming in ourselves; it is not only that our past is always ours with our present; we are personally and actively continuous, by the work of interpenetration and permeation, with life as it concentrates in the becoming of other persons, or is embraced in other things. The psychological secret of our communication with other persons is the secret of the world for us. It is only by permeation that Spirit reaches Spirit, and communicates itself and its riches; but permeation, communication, the gift of Spirit and the mutual giving of God and of men is the world's truth. All else is mere expediency for action upon things and of intelligence; or it is fiction. When we cut the world into pieces and isolate piece from piece by a process of intelligence, we act reasonably; because we are in the material world to act upon it, and we rightly think that world in terms of the easiest action upon it. But when we look at life as a whole, and as we live it, when we try to penetrate the psychological secret of ourselves, we find the artificiality of our dividing lines, the schematic nature of our world of isolated and merely juxtaposing bits, pieces, bodies. We discover a wonderful, magic-working process, in which we ourselves are becoming ever new and newer creatures, while remaining always enduring creatures who never die in any part or stage of their creative becoming. And we discover that there is no real isolation; there is no separateness of the enduring, cumulative streams of becoming that are you and I and every one of us. They come from God, they are of Him, although each one has its personal owner; and God Himself is closer to each than breathing, nearer than hands and feet. But although He is so near, He is not identical with us. He is the source of the stream of life, and it is His life; but He is not the stream. We are the stream, or, rather, we are elements—cumulative, enduring elements—in the stream, elements that roll up on themselves, like snowballs rather than streams. And He, our source, He Himself, encounters us ourselves, not as He is immanent in the stream, but as He is transcendent to it and personally related with it. He gives us the opportunity to resist Him, or to meet Him, know, love, feel Him, and harmonise ourselves with Him. If He

were only immanent, in the stream. He would bear us along irresistibly, as the current of life does bear us along irresistibly, bears us inevitably living, and inevitably living in the current. In personal freedom of dominance over the relations of life and the use we make of them, and in the creative office we fill for ourselves as we stamp unique personal character upon our own stream, He meets us, appeals to us, pleads with us, to let Him help us; He comes to us as a Saviour, not as a force.

WM. SCOTT PALMER.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

SI VIS PACEM, PARA BELLUM.

DURING the past month European States have been zealously endeavouring on the one hand to safeguard peace, and on the other hand to make ready for war, so that, come what might, they should not be taken unawares. Their love of peace became articulate chiefly in the jargon of diplomatic acts, while their solicitude to have their loins girded and their powder dry at the war trumpet's blast is finding adequate, perhaps redundant, expression in the building of strategic railways, the reorganisation of armies, the perfecting of rifles and artillery, and the acquisition of devoted allies. For a new era of the world's history is manifestly beginning, and the Powers are arranging their plans in advance. Fortune's wheel is about to receive another turn, and the players in the game of politics are putting on their stakes. *Faites votre jeu, Messieurs! Faites votre jeu!*

The Baltic and the North Sea Agreements are instanced as the chief manifestations of the love of a pacific existence which partially animates Europe. Certainly one is glad to welcome them as additional pledges of that desirable peace which is ever eluding the pursuit of nations as happiness keeps slipping from the grasp of individuals. By the Baltic Declarations, the four littoral Powers of that sea recognise in principle each other's territorial *status quo*. The North Sea Agreement, to which six Powers—Germany, Great Britain, France, Holland, Denmark and Sweden—are parties, lays down a like principle in regard to the North Sea. Consequently, on the 24th April, the representatives of "the high contracting parties" stipulated that they would preserve intact their respective territorial rights in the regions mentioned, and in case of aggression concert with each other with a view to maintaining the *status quo*. Another stipulation was signed at Stockholm by the representatives of Great Britain, France and Sweden, denouncing the treaty of 1885 by which Sweden was not to cede any territory to Russia, and

had bound herself to inform the two Western Powers of any requests of this nature that might be made to her; and France and England undertook, in return, to help her to withstand Russia's blandishments, threats and aggression.

To the average reader the Baltic declaration seems very clear. But an influential Russian press organ has put an unexpected interpretation upon it which cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged. The point at issue is whether or no Russia may now legally fortify the Aland Islands in case of war. And the *Novoye Vremya* affirms that the Baltic Declaration authorises the Tsardom to exercise all its sovereign rights over the Archipelago, including that of using it as a naval base, whenever it thinks fit. The reader can judge for himself on the basis of the following data.

MAY RUSSIA FORTIFY THE ALAND ISLANDS?

In the year 1855 France and Britain rendered themselves responsible for the integrity of Sweden and Norway, which were then united under the sovereignty of the King of Sweden. In the following year they obliged Russia, whom they had defeated in the Crimean War, to waive her right to fortify the Aland Archipelago or to create a naval base there. The former treaty lapsed in June, 1905, when the Scandinavian Union was dissolved in whose favour it had been concluded. And this fact was expressly declared in March, 1908, by the Powers concerned. But does the dissolution of the Scandinavian Union affect the treaty of 1855, which was an obligation imposed upon Russia by Great Britain and France not to fortify any of the Aland Islands? Obviously not. For in this case Russia's obligation was towards France and Great Britain, Powers that continue to exist, and not towards the Scandinavian Union. The Russian journal relies upon the contention that this self-denying ordinance was made in favour of Sweden. But of this there is no trace in the treaty or elsewhere. It was an undertaking made by Russia in favour of France and Great Britain, and it will be, therefore, in force until it pleases the parties to abrogate it.

The Baltic declaration has a memorandum appended to it for the purpose of preventing misunderstandings about this very point. According to this appendix, "the principle of the maintenance of the *status quo* recognised in this declaration relates only to the territorial integrity of all the present possessions of the high contracting parties in the districts bordering on the Baltic Sea; and consequently the declaration can in no way be appealed to when the free exercise of sovereign rights by the high contracting parties in their possessions above mentioned is concerned." Now the meaning of these words is clear. The object of this addition is obviously to

deprive Sweden of the right of regarding the declaration as a promise made to her by Russia not to fortify the Aland Islands. But the memorandum cannot, of course, dispense the Tsar's Government from its obligations towards Great Britain and France, who are not parties to the present declaration. These two Powers may—if they choose—release Russia from her promise, and whenever they do so, she will be free to exercise her sovereign rights without protest from any nation, in virtue of the memorandum. The declaration without the memorandum would have bound her to Sweden, Germany and Denmark in the same way in which she was already bound to France and Great Britain. And in this case she would probably never recover her sovereign rights by dint of diplomacy alone.

At best, however, the discussion possesses only academic interest. In peace time the declaration holds good until abrogated by the parties. But parchment is useless as a barrier in war time. Suppose, for a moment, that Russia were at war with some naval nation which had not signed the Baltic Declaration. Let us call that country X. X's squadron enters the Gulf of Bothnia for the purpose of making a descent on the coast. The Tsar's navy, on the other hand, endeavours to hinder this. Now the most effectual way of withstanding the enemy would obviously be to despatch a fighting squadron to the Skerries. And this would involve the fortifying of some of the Aland Islands, the accumulation of military stores there, the storing of coal, and the putting up of machinery needed for repairing the vessels. Sweden thereupon would protest, because the fortification of the Archipelago would constitute a serious danger to Stockholm. But the Swedes would, of course, be aware that if Russia did not seize on the islands and utilise them thus, X's fleet would, because it too must have a good naval base, and there is none better than the Aland Archipelago. What, then, would Russia do? Would she allow herself to be defeated in order that Sweden should be contented, or would she defend herself by exercising her sovereign rights over the Archipelago? To ask this question is to answer it.

PATIENCE FOR MACEDONIA: A CONCERT FOR EUROPE.

Every nation, like every individual, can readily be patient in everything except—waiting. And Macedonia is no exception to the rule. In the matter of waiting, the inhabitants of the three provinces of that country have got to the end of their staying powers, and what may next happen has not yet been defined, provided for, or even foreseen. The parties concerned feel that it may be fraught

with far-reaching consequences. Hence they move cautiously, and seem to be following the Irish maxim, "If ye can't be aisy, be as 'aisy as ye can." Even Turkey is alive to the necessity of circumspection. Aware that the next fateful move may come from Bulgaria, she has gone out of her way to conciliate the Principality, whose friendship for England began to alarm the Sultan. For instance, during the past eighteen months there were two Episcopal Sees vacant in Macedonia, and the Bulgarian Exarch repeatedly requested the Porte to fill them up, but in vain. Now both prelates have been nominated, the religious sentiment of the flocks is satisfied, and Prince Ferdinand's Government has been captivated. Besides this gracious act, the Ottoman Government has reopened a number of Macedonian schools, which had been closed. Then, again, the Turkish Commissary in Sofia, who was very unpopular in that city, has been recalled, and Kiamil Bey, ex-consul in Liverpool, sent in his place. In a word, the relations between Turkey and Bulgaria are visibly improved. The Sultan is thus making the best of the time of grace which the European "Concert" has given him. During the jarring discord made by the tuning of fiddles, the savage, whose breast the diplomatic music is to tame, is taking his own measures to withstand its charms. And the truce has already lasted longer than was expected.

Over a month has elapsed since the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs delivered his much applauded speech in the Duma on the subject of Macedonian reforms, and as yet no agreement has been come to. Doubtless the difficulties in the way were formidable, and in spite of them, it is credibly affirmed, a certain headway has been made. Russia's reply to the British proposals has been forwarded to our Foreign Office, and on certain points the two Governments are said to be at one, while on others they are still disagreed. It is difficult, however, to understand how any compromise can be effected unless one side or the other abandons its main position. Either effectual means of helping the people of Macedonia will be taken, and in this case Russia will resume her rôle as protectress of the Balkan Slavs, and Turkey's authority will be impaired once more, or else Turkey will be humoured, and this involves the abandonment by our Foreign Office of its proposals. Between these two extremes there would seem to be no golden mean.

THE BRITISH PROPOSALS ARE ADVANTAGEOUS TO THE PORTE.

The Sultan's hold on Macedonia is at best precarious and costly. Like Spain's refusal to give up Cuba, which was a constant drain on her resources, Turkey's persistent clinging to Macedonia is largely

sentimental. Certainly it is not financial, for every year of Ottoman domination costs the Porte a sum varying from five hundred thousand to a million pounds sterling. Many people imagined that the balance was on the other side, and that the money extorted from the Sultan's ill-starred Christian subjects in Macedonia constituted the main attraction. Facts and figures, however, prove the contrary. Turkish misrule in Macedonia is pernicious alike to the governors and the misgoverned. It has been shown that during the financial year ending last March the Porte paid to Macedonia no less than 505,000 Turkish pounds, and the moment the year was closed the Treasury was obliged to come to the aid of the Macedonian finances to the extent of 60,000 Turkish pounds. The amount required for the support of the garrison in all three provinces—that garrison which our Foreign Office would fain see gradually withdrawn—is computed at about £1,300,000, while £300,000 are required for the gendarmes, and for the kilometrical railway guarantee over £300,000 are needed.

It is hardly possible to deny under such circumstances that the Porte would gain largely were it to adopt at least that one of the British proposals which deals with the garrison. The enormous and unproductive outlay which the keep of the troops involves would then be obviated without inconvenience, and the money saved might be utilised for cultural reforms. Every party, or almost every party, would be the better for this: the population, the Ottoman Empire, and the peace of Europe. The German banks, who do a thriving business in Turkey to-day, might perhaps find their lines fallen to them in unpleasant places. As money is chronically wanted and debts are being constantly incurred, at present Turkey is necessarily growing less and less solvent, and a time must come when all the liquid resources of the Empire will barely suffice for the payment of interest on the debt. German banks, which advance money at exorbitant rates of interest, are the only institutions that can afford to wait for this contingency with serenity.

THE CAUSES OF INTERNECINE STRIFE.

Spring is usually the season of troubles in Macedonia. When the snow has thawed, and groups of armed men can move freely about, the work of fire and blood begins. Greek, Servian and Bulgarian bands ravage the country, burn down the dwellings, and kill or wound the members of the rival nationalities. This year the bands have already entered upon their sanguinary mission. In the vilayet of Ueskub the companies of the Voyevoda Peshkovich, and in the province of Salonica numerous bands of Greeks are active and destructive. The unfortunate Bulgarian population suffers most from these cutthroats and incendiaries.

It is a grave scandal to the civilised world that the Christian populations of Macedonia should thus wage a war of ruthless destruction against each other. But one easily understands the position and attitude of the Greeks, who feel themselves outnumbered by the Slavs and threatened with national extinction. Hence their antipathy to the Slavs is rancorous and blinding. They will hear of no compromise with their future destroyers. Between Serb and Bulgar there is also war to the death, and the cause, although less obvious, is also intelligible. The realm of King Peter includes only a portion of Servian lands, and not even the greater portion, just as at first the Principality of Bulgaria comprehended only a part of the Bulgars, who also inhabited Eastern Roumelia and Macedonia. Bulgaria very soon succeeded in uniting Eastern Roumelia to the Principality, and is now striving to draw in Macedonia as well. The Serbs are naturally discontented that they should be effectually hindered from recovering any part of their unredeemed territory. Even the Greeks are now at last obtaining Crete. For the Powers who, during the past eleven years, have kept garrisons there have recently agreed to evacuate the island. That amounts to informal permission to Greece to annex Crete. And while these accessions of territory are being made by Greece and Bulgaria, Servia alone is condemned to wait without hope. Part of her heritage—Bosnia and Herzegovina—has been given over to Austria-Hungary, and lest her energies should be employed in wresting the remainder from the grip of Turkey, they are being cunningly turned against her kinsmen the Bulgarians. *Divide et impera* is Austria's maxim. And congruously with that policy Servia has long been a marplot among the Slavs. Under King Milan—Austria's vassal—she declared war against Bulgaria in 1885. And to-day many of her most intrepid sons, like Peshkovich and Traiko, are carrying fire and sword to Macedonia.

At this gruesome spectacle the Turks are delighted. Conniving at the bands they persecute the Bulgarian population of the villages who are generally unarmed and incapable of resisting. Searches for arms, domiciliary raids, fines, flogging are of frequent occurrence. Even torture is not wholly eliminated. And all this is done in the sight of the European officers, whose only means of action are to photograph, report and complain. Last year over 2,000 individuals fell in Macedonia over and above the wounded. And no wonder. Towards the close of the year there were no less than one hundred and ten active bands in Macedonia, consisting of 1,200 well-armed men. Of these, 54 per cent. were Bulgarian Macedonians, 30 per cent. were Greeks, and 15 per cent. Serbs. Now, if the gendarmerie had been increased numerically, and authorised to drive out these cutthroats once for all, a most terrible evil would have been extir-

pated. And that is the object of another of Sir Edward Grey's proposals. Russia and also, of course, Germany oppose this reform as derogatory to Turkey's authority and dignity, and the counter-proposal elaborated by the Tsar's Government and approved by Germany and Austria, consists in enlisting rural guards in the country, and equipping them to protect their respective villages. In a former article I ventured to say that this experiment had already been tried, and been seen to be a failure. The guards turned out to be wolves employed as shepherds, and the flocks suffered more than if they had been left to the mercy of their enemies.

RUSSIA'S PROPOSED REVIVAL OF RURAL GUARDS WORSE, THAN USELESS.

Since then I have received trustworthy data, which go to show that this forecast was correct. The Austrian Ambassador in Constantinople lately requested the Porte to supply him with the statistics of these rural guards, and the Sultan's officials complied with his request most willingly. Official figures were placed at his service next day, and this is the instructive story they tell. The "guards" have always behaved very badly on the whole, doing more harm than good, and taking an active part in the bands which it was their duty to put down. During the last four years, for example, nearly four hundred of them have been punished as members of these gangs of murderers and firebrands. Of these 236 had been taken from the Bulgarian element of the population, 83 from the Greek, and 74 from the Servian. How many others there were who deserved, without receiving, similar punishment is unknown. Now to arm these men anew and to give them a pittance to resist their comrades in arms, as Russia proposes, would in truth be an attempt to cast out devils by Beelzebub.

Unless efficacious means are taken to check the advance of the guerilla bands, it is on the cards that more serious troubles may break out than have yet been recorded. That the building of the Novi Bazar Line will be completed without outbursts of popular violence is almost inconceivable. The Albanians, many of whom are friends of Austria, are said to be making common cause with Roumanians and Greeks for the purpose of throttling the Slav element in Bulgaria. It is a political crusade, or unholy war. Obviously it is not to the interest of Turkey, Austria, or even Germany that this League should be dissolved. For Germany, too, has now a powerful interest in Macedonia. One cannot help noting as a significant fact that this Austrian railway in the Sandjak of Novi Bazar is being financed, not as people believed at the outset, by a Vienna or Budapesth company of capitalists, but by the German Bank in Berlin, that same Deutsche Bank which is constructing the Bagdad Trunk

Line. Thus Germany is active while France and France's political friends are handicapped or listless.

FRANCE HANDICAPPED IN MOROCCO.

M. Hanotaux, who was for long the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, recently published his view of the Balkan tangle and a stricture on what he considers the fatuous policy pursued by his own countrymen to-day. France's action in Morocco, he affirms—and this opinion has been mine ever since the Algeçiras Conference met—is superlatively unwise. For it draws her attention away from Europe at a most critical moment, when it is all important that she should have a voice in international affairs there. Austrian and German railway building in Asia Minor, M. Hanotaux goes on to write, however helpful to German interests, is baleful to those of France; but, unhappily, is not felt to be this. And yet it is easy to perceive that the new line will divert the world's trade from French to Adriatic and Ægean ports, and arrest the growth of French commerce. For the aim pursued by the builders of the German and Austrian trunk lines is to cause all the world traffic of Europe to pass through Germany and the Balkan Peninsula, and thence on the Bagdad Railway to India. Germany is thus clearing her way to the East. And France, instead of safeguarding her own interests and maintaining the equilibrium of Europe, is shooting down fanatical Moors or having her sons shot down by them, squandering millions in Morocco, and working generally, as her own statesmen put it, *pour le roi de Prusse*.

DIPLOMACY BY MEANS OF RAILWAY BUILDING AND HEGEMONY BY MEANS OF FORMIDABLE NAVIES.

Most of the diplomatic triumphs of the future will be scored by means of railways, just as the hegemony of Continents will be won by feats of formidable battleships. The nations which fail to discern and act upon these new conditions of political success must abide by the consequences. Germany is resolved not to be taken unawares. She is thriftily financing the Bagdad and the Novi Bazar Lines, besides constructing a fleet of powerful ships which, unless Great Britain awakes to consciousness of the danger, and makes heroic sacrifices to avert it, will be superior to ours in four years from now. Yet Germany is rather pressed for money, and has never possessed such a vast available capital as her insular rival. But her people have that which outweighs mere wealth: they possess in a high degree the virtue of patriotic self-abnegation, which, like faith, moves mountains. Their enterprise in Asia Minor is one of several illustrations of this.

For several years little or nothing has been heard of the Bagdad Railway enterprise. And yet it was neither dead nor sleeping. It kept growing under the hands of Prussian engineers. No nation nowadays takes really long views of politics or pursues one and the same desirable and attainable aim with energy, perseverance, and judicious adjustment of means to ends, except Japan and Germany. And with these two peoples politics are a sort of inspiring religion, which is not devoid of its superstition and fanaticism, but is capable of working miracles of self-sacrifice. From the day on which the Turkish Minister of Public Works, Zikhny Pasha, signed the Convention with Dr. Türck-Sander, head manager of the Ottoman Anatolian Railway, respecting the proposed Bagdad Line that is to connect Hamburg with the Persian Gulf, Germany has never turned back nor hesitated. Hindrances sprang up on all sides; discouragement was intense and universal; opposition was virulent and aggressive; in a word, the conditions were so unfavourable that a retreat would have been natural and excusable. But Germany persisted. And now she is on the eve of success.

THE BAGDAD RAILWAY QUESTION IS ON THE EVE OF SETTLEMENT.

Money was the main requisite and it was not forthcoming. If the enterprise had been financed in its entirety by a Government or a financial syndicate there would have been no hitch anywhere. But, even in spite of the absence of this guarantee during the past six years, the line has been brought to Konia across a densely-populated land, thanks to tireless activity, plodding industry, backstairs influence and international solicitation. One can neither withhold one's admiration for the depth and strength of the forces that have thus been displayed by the leaders of the German nation, nor repress one's heartfelt desire to see similar qualities enlisted in the service of the British people. To-day the Germans are come to the end of their resources, and not even the help of the Deutsche Bank can dispense them from the need of co-operation from outside. As yet, however, this fact has not been bruited abroad. It has been whispered among friends or hinted to possible investors. But the ground is being carefully prepared for foreign financial participation, so carefully, so ingeniously, and so perseveringly that the British people could not do better than take a leaf from Germany's book. France's help is more eagerly sought after than that of Great Britain, because the line of resistance there is believed to be considerably less. Enormous sums of money are held ready for investment by well-to-do citizens of the Republic, and a little suasion would move them to loosen their purse strings. Germany,

always ready with a *quid pro quo*, would gladly, it is affirmed, make political concessions in Morocco in return for financial assistance in Asia Minor. Indeed, Germany's political interests in the Sultanate looked as if they had no other justification. But one is reluctant to believe that one great cultured nation would raise formidable difficulties in the way of another solely in order to sell its good behaviour at an exorbitant rate later on.

FRENCH PARTICIPATION IS DESIRED.

Seven hundred million francs, or twenty-eight million pounds sterling, is the amount still needed to bring this vast railway undertaking to a satisfactory issue. And owing to the present scarcity of money in the German market, and to the great difficulty of raising any such sum without a guaranteed rate of interest, France's help is highly desirable. For a loan cannot well be negotiated on ordinary business lines, because there can be no return for the outlay during the first twelve years or more without a State guarantee of a certain percentage per kilometre. That is why Germany has had to wage a struggle against difficulties for a two-fold object: to raise the requisite capital in Western Europe and to find some source of income in Turkey capable of furnishing the wherewithal for a kilometric guarantee that would pay interest on that capital. From Great Britain she entertains but slender hope of receiving the capital or a considerable part of it. For nobody likes to be asked to cut a stick to beat his own back, and the people of Great Britain cannot be reasonably expected to raise up a rival to themselves in India. The French people have no such misgivings. Long ago ex-Finance Minister, M. Rouvier, whose predilection for railway enterprises is a matter of common knowledge, formed a financial group favourable to co-operation with Germany, and he persuaded the Government of the Republic to further its aims and interests. And this would seem to have been done by the French Ambassador in Constantinople, who received instructions to second the demands of the strawmen of the German Government, who besought the Porte to unify the Ottoman debt, to create further monopolies, and to raise the tithe taxes on the Sandjaks in order to obtain fresh sources for a kilometric guarantee. Heretofore these efforts were unavailing, and the Deutsche Bank had to bear the weight of the enterprise on its own shoulders. Happily the line was then being constructed in a country that offered few technical difficulties and supported a large population. But these conditions came to an end at Konia.

At present the railway is being carried further than Konia into the rugged country that is in some sort a prolongation of the Taurus mountain range, and a stretch of one hundred and thirty miles,

bristling with technical difficulties, awaits the engineering skill and financial resources of Germany. And even far beyond that distance the country will continue to be unfavourable—a marshy, uninhabited land, where working men are few, food is scarce, traffic is slight, and highway robbery is common. The bridges, too, over the Tigris and the Euphrates must be long and durable, and cannot but be costly. All this presupposes capital, and France is therefore being cautiously approached on the subject, and many bids have been made for her good will. In May, 1907, a committee for the cultivation of friendship between the two nations was formed in Berlin. It held its first meeting last February, and it was followed by two other societies, whose objects are almost identical with this. The identity, however, is not perfect. The Committee pursues an ideological aim—it seeks to bridge over the gulf which the war of 1870 created, and to obliterate all thoughts of revenge. The other societies pursue more concrete, more material ends. Thus the eminent representatives of German banks consider that utilitarian objects would prove more solid and lasting as the groundwork for the friendship of the two neighbours. Germany's industry is become so vast that it can absorb almost unlimited capital, while France's available capital is well nigh unlimited. She has been financing Russia until over eight thousand million francs are gone, and now Berlin would be glad to turn this stream of gold—which is certain to go on flowing beyond the French borders—into German channels.

THE WOOING OF FRANCE BY GERMANY.

The most influential organs of the German Press are taking part in this strenuous endeavour to win over France as a commercial partner. These journals, which represent various parties, have forgotten for a while their internal quarrels and are working zealously together for this great national end.

And the work of politico-commercial wooing is moving apace. France is not insensible to the advances of the Teuton. The other day a number of French students and professors, invited to visit Germany, were received there with open arms. Conquering heroes returning from the battlefields where they had won laurels and immortality could not have been welcomed more warmly. Berlin paid homage to them in the town hall. Museums, theatres, schools, vied with each other in doing such honour to these unripe lads as would be exaggerated were they Newtons, Laplaces, Darwins and Edisons. This is the verdict of sober Germans. "The intellectual and moral Union of Germany and France" was the text of an eloquent discourse delivered by the French Ambassador. And a thorough-going German made a practical suggestion

to bring this about: let fifty thousand young Frenchmen, he said, marry fifty thousand young German girls every year, and fifty thousand Germans espouse the same number of French girls every year, and the problem is solved.

A few days ago when Kaiser Wilhelm was sojourning in the Hoh Königsburg in Alsace, unusual festivities were organised in his honour. Many simple-minded people, mostly French, fancied that he would inaugurate a new era by proclaiming the autonomy of the two provinces. They were disappointed. A curious detail is narrated by the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, which affirms that the French Press was induced to despatch correspondents to the festivities by the suasion of the German Embassy in Paris. "If that be true," writes an influential German paper, ". it must be characterised as exceedingly misplaced, aye shameful. Must we for ever go on forcing our blandishments upon people who do not want them?"*

Germany's political love-making may be clumsy and brutal, but her aptitude for business is undoubted. And success tells. M. Rouvier's financial group, which was dissolved for a time, has come to life again. The vague and veiled allusions to possible concessions in Morocco are said to be now assuming definite shape: perfect freedom of action for France in the Barbary State in return for financial support for the railway in Asia Minor. And the French Government, it is added, lends a willing ear to the proposal, which, however, it would fain enlarge. A share in the property and a voice in the management of the railway are said to be the terms for which M. Clemenceau's Cabinet is holding out. A settlement, therefore, is probable, and it will in all probability culminate in the discovery of a source in Turkey for the kilometric guarantee. Thirty-five million francs yearly, over and above the annual sum at present paid by the Ottoman Government as interest on its foreign debt, will bring the inevitable financial crash much nearer. The upshot of the matter—shrewd politicians predict—will be that the German bailiff will take possession and France will have less to show for her money than in the case of the Suez Canal. It cannot be gainsaid, however, that French bankers have an inducement to take part in the coming "deal." Whatever else happens, they stand to gain by speculating on the emission. But French investors may stand to lose, and the French nation may also incur a loss that will be irremediable.

Of one thing one may feel assured: the Bagdad Railway will do more than any other line that has been built since railways were first invented to change the face of the political world, and to help Germany to that influential position among the nations of the earth towards which she has been so eagerly, so persistently, and so efficaciously striving.

* *The Hannoversche Courier.*

RUSSIA, GREAT BRITAIN AND AFGHANISTAN.

Although a twelvemonth has not yet elapsed since Sir Arthur Nicolson and M. Izvolsky signed the Anglo-Russian Convention, it has stood well more than one severe test. The last of these is the upshot of the very complex situation on the Indo-Afghan border. The Ameer's subjects made an incursion into Indian territory, which was manifestly concerted, well organised, and not unknown to or forbidden by the Afghan authorities. In the second half of April, mullahs, preaching a holy war, led the invaders across the Cabul river in large numbers and with a disregard of secrecy which throws an unpleasant light on the attitude of the Ameer. Doubtless the Afghan ruler is not an absolute monarch. He has to make allowance for the prejudices of his unruly subjects, and sometimes he may deem it wise not only to sympathise with their aims but to appear to further them. Hence the patience and reserve of the British public were politic. Events have since shown that they were also warranted. For the Ameer has recalled his bellicose subjects, explained the tardiness of his intervention by the lateness of his information, and expressed his regret that what was common knowledge to his officials should have remained hidden from himself for several weeks. "Better late than never" is the most favourable comment one can well pass on this equivocal conduct, which apparently threatened to re-open the far-reaching issues which had kept Russia and England at daggers drawn for a whole generation. But it was only apparently.

If this incursion of the Ameer's feudatories into Indian territory, the rising of the Mohmands and the outbreak of anarchism in India had all occurred simultaneously a couple of years ago, the consequences might have been tragical. But coming as they did after the Anglo-Russian Convention their effect was completely deadened. And yet we should be careful to remember that, so far as Afghanistan is concerned, Russia's position this May is exactly what it was three or five years ago. For that section of the Convention which has to do with Afghanistan does not come into force until the Ameer's assent has been given. And Habibullah has not as yet agreed to it. Russia is, therefore, not bound by that part of the understanding: her position being exactly what it was. Not only, however, has there been no disposition on the part of any member of the Government to abuse it, but neither in Press nor Parliament have any signs of such a wish been displayed.

Even if the worst had come to the worst, and the Ameer had sided with his warlike subjects, there would not have been the slightest ground for anticipating friction between Russia and Great

Britain. For on both sides the spirit of the Convention was allowed to stand for the letter. Russia, taking it for granted that the British Government would abide by its declaration, and that no design is harboured of altering the international status of Afghanistan, allowed it to be understood that she on her part would keep her promise, even though it had not formally received the force of a diplomatic stipulation. No misgivings were entertained on either side, because, whatever might happen, it was felt that the new situation would be dealt with in the same pacific and conciliating spirit which had inspired the Convention. Now this attitude, coming after generations of undisguised distrust and masked hostility, marks an advance towards cordial friendship which might have seemed impossible three years ago. On such a spirit, which is not confined to the Governments, both nations deserve to be congratulated.

RUSSIAN ARMY REFORM.

It is evident from this that during the last four years Russia has forgotten much and learned much, and has greatly benefited by her painful experience. Europe has all the more reason, therefore, for wishing to see her speedily resume the place which she filled before the war. But of this there are, unhappily, no immediate signs. Russia's internal condition, essentially what it was two years ago, baffles all her efforts to rise to her former level. Nothing is changed but appearances. Terrorism has, indeed, ceased to be acute, but only because the laws have been sharpened a hundred-fold, and a modified state of siege has been proclaimed over most districts of the Empire. The political pyramid is standing on its apex. Hence it is bound to fall very soon, and a great crash will come with it. Capital punishment is frequent—eight persons on an average are executed every day—the prisons are overcrowded, assassination is rife, demoralisation widespread, suicide is abnormally frequent, mine and countermine are going on continually. And parallel with mental and moral retrogression go political immaturity and partial economic decay, which no superficial reforms will check.

After an unsuccessful war, one of the first cares of a capable Government, one would think, would be the reorganisation of the army. But Russia, although nearly three years have passed since the campaign was concluded, is only now beginning the task, and as yet has not got beyond the stage of a project elaborated by a national military council. Even this, however, is a stride in the right direction. For the condition of the army is deplorable. And yet the raw materials are excellent. Russia might possess the most formidable army in the world, if she but knew how to make the best of

at Kharbin, and to await the enemy there. But for the sake of Port Arthur and its Russian defenders he had to renounce the only means that could have led to the end aimed at, and was obliged to adopt a course of action which he felt would be fatal. Well, the selfsame error is being committed in respect of the next war by the building of the Amoor Railway. The Government intends to use it for colonising the country with Russians. If it succeeds the nation will be morally obliged to defend its colonists whenever war is being waged, and consequently to withstand the Japs or the Chinese, not where resistance will be most advantageous, but in the Amoor country. Now strategists maintain that that would be a fatal blunder. • Russia's best and, indeed, only efficacious method of defence would be to withdraw entirely from the Amoor Province and to await the invaders in Transbaikalia. But now, as so often before in Russian history, airy hope triumphs over painful experience.

EMANCIPATION .OR DISFRANCHISEMENT FOR RUSSIAN JEWS.

The unwieldiness of the army is another evil that must be grappled with at all costs. Tens of thousands of so-called soldiers who wear the Tsar's uniform cannot fire a rifle or handle a sabre, and will never enter the field of battle. They belong to an army within the army, which is composed of hangers-on, tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, tinkers, drummers and general servants. These people constitute a hindrance rather than a help, and should, therefore, be dispensed with. An army of 300,000 well-trained, zealous, trusty soldiers would defend the nation more effectually and successfully than the present assemblage of over a million and a quarter, of whom, perhaps, the best fighting men are those of the Warsaw Military District. At present poverty-stricken Russia supports in peace time a mighty force of 1,260,000 men, whereas Germany is contented with 585,000. Naturally she is unable to give them military training, the material well-being, or the mental and moral instruction which she could easily bestow on four or five hundred thousand. And in war time Russia's army is not any larger in numbers than that of Germany, whereas it is immeasurably inferior in all the acquired qualifications that make an efficient military organism. Many military men perceive these evils and are eager to have them uprooted. The formula they have adopted is: all useless or harmful elements in the army must be weeded out.

That is how the question came to be mooted as to whether the Jews should be admitted to serve in the army as heretofore, or be

excluded. If any section of the population may be described as a solvent of military discipline, said the Conservatives, it is the Jewish. Statistics tell a story which ought to have opened the eyes of the Government long ago to the grave danger that threatened the country. But happily it is not yet too late. The Jews hate military service, and they show it. Summoned as recruits to the colours, a large proportion of them shirk their duty and abscond. Enlisted in the regiments they mutilate themselves or sham illness. On the battlefield they surrender themselves. Champions of the Jewish cause reply that the facts are not as alleged; that the statistics are garbled and the conclusions drawn from them are misleading. Thus the number of Jews called to arms every year is, they aver, proportionately greater than the number summoned from the other nationalities. And this statement would seem to be well established. Then there is the other undoubted fact that Jews emigrate in much greater numbers than any other element of the population. This plea is disallowed by the other side on the ground that what is termed emigration is really a shirking of duty.

It is fair to say that at present this discussion is barren and mischievous. For the statistics available are not trustworthy, and it is affirmed that years must elapse before sufficient data are brought together for an adequate judgment. Meanwhile one point seems clear to me. If it be fair and right to exclude the Jews from the army, it will be just and necessary to deprive them of their right of voting for deputies to the Duma. This is a corollary of that, and it is but one of many corollaries. Now no such wide-reaching change could be effected without imposing upon the Government the moral obligation of entirely remodelling the Constitution as established by the Fundamental Laws. True, the population of the Caucasus is exempted from military service, yet it sends a number of representatives to the Parliament. This, however, is a contradiction which will disappear when M. Stolypin's hasty makeshift of a Government has been superseded by a rational regime that may be expected to last at least a lifetime.

FINLAND DECLARES AGAINST THE JEWS.

A conference was held at Helsingfors on 3rd May, the labours of which will be long remembered by Finns and Jews. It consisted of the representatives of commercial and industrial societies and of trade guilds throughout the Grand Duchy, who had been summoned to discuss the question of emancipating Jews in Finland. From time immemorial Finland has been virtually closed to members of the Jewish faith, and the few who were allowed to enter by way of

exception received but scant encouragement to stay. Now, however, that the Finnish people have a full measure of home rule and a thoroughly democratic government, it was assumed that they would be glad to do as they had been done by and relieve the Jews of their disabilities. And to deal with this problem was the main object of the conference. Accordingly one hundred and thirty-five delegates from all parts of Finland gathered together, and set themselves to consider in the first place the petition laid before the Chamber by the Socialists asking that all Jews entering the Grand Duchy should be treated as foreigners, and that all Jews who reside three years in the country should receive the rights of citizens.

Orator after orator rose in the Assembly and inveighed against the Socialist petition as dangerous, or inopportune. One by one they dragged out the old stock arguments of anti-Semites, quoted the "immoral doctrines" of the Talmud, which they had never read even in translation, stigmatised the Jews as unscrupulous and greedy, and affirmed that they had uniformly shown themselves hostile to the Finnish people. And the great majority of delegates applauded the speakers. The upshot of the discussion was the rejection of the Socialist petition and the passing of a resolution calling on the authorities to insist on the rigorous application of the present anti-Jewish legislation, and exhorting the Government not to bring the Jewish question before the Diet until it has first been thoroughly debated in all its aspects by a committee created expressly for this. Thus in Finland, as in Russia, the emancipation of the Jews has been indefinitely put off.

THE DEMOCRATISING DUMA.

Russia, still crippled and feeble, cannot yet think of resuming her former position in world-politics. Nor, sooth to say, is there much prospect of her recovering strength in the near future. For the injuries from which she suffers are graver than was generally believed, while her recuperative forces have been over-rated. Then, again, the treatment employed is no remedy. Foreigners, whose judgment is untrammelled by a knowledge of details, saw in the establishment of representative institutions of the Western type the one specific for all Russia's maladies. And as they possess the treasury whence Russia draws, and must for many years continue to draw, her resources, their prescription has been taken. Hence a representative Duma sits in St. Petersburg and can never again be abolished. But only an optimist in a hurry would say that Russia has profited by the change. Meanwhile cynics take a delight in watching the Duma, favourite child of Western liberalism, propose

to disfranchise the Jews still further, vote for a strategic railway in a form which is a challenge to Japan, squander hundreds of millions in dangerous enterprises, and demean itself as only political heretics of the worst type could behave. In a word, the Duma is acting up to its lights, and it is nobody's fault if they resemble those of the foolish virgins on the arrival of the bridegroom.

But none the less the trend of the Duma is democratic although its pace is duly slow. And while one may rail at its conflicting qualities, it is impossible to gainsay the fact that it is owing mainly to these that it has accomplished what was beyond the power of the first and second Dumas to effect. For within six months it has abolished autocracy and set a limited monarchy in its place. Prince Ukhtomsky's press organ sadly affirms that against the precedents created by the third Duma no power in Russia can ever hope to struggle with success. Count Witte had caught, so to say, the butterfly of autocracy and confined it in the apartments of the Tavrida Palace. But he took care to leave all doors and windows open for it to escape. It was reserved for M. Stolypin and the Deputies of the third Duma to close the doors and windows, catch the butterfly, put it painlessly to death, and pin it to the board. Twice over the present Chamber, which works harmoniously with the Premier, has deliberately deprived the monarch of his title of autocrat. In the second half of April it joined issue with him on the question of an Imperial Ukase approving the Railway Minister's estimates. The Tsar, relying on a certain clause in the Fundamental Laws, ordered the estimates to receive the force of law and therefore to be withdrawn from the competency of the Duma. But the Duma denied the Monarch's right to act thus, set aside his Ukase as illegal, and by way of manifesting its own power to act, cut down the estimates by a rouble.*

THE PREMIER FURTHERS THE CAUSE OF PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT.

And in this work of democratisation the Prime Minister has been ably seconding the Duma. The leader and the led play deftly into each other's hands. When the Duma intended to refuse the eleven million roubles demanded by the Government for the construction of battleships, it first felt its way, nor did it take the fateful step until it was assured that the Premier would accept the vote with composure. Then, and only then, did the committee on imperial defences refuse to assign the money. M. Stolypin's friends affirm that he is continuously surrounded by court cabals which it takes time and energy to circumvent. However this may be he

* As a matter of fact the Duma was formally right. The Imperial Ukase had invoked the wrong paragraph.

has never loosened his grasp of the reins of government, and already he shares with the Duma the spoils of power won from the autocracy. An illustration of this change was given quite recently, when the Finance Minister, who is wont to weigh his words, blurted out in a speech before the Duma: "Thank God we have no parliament." Next day the Speaker of the House deliberately characterised the phrase as unfortunate, and then promised, but subsequently refused, to apologise for what he had said. M. Kokofftseff, offended, was in a mood to resign, and M. Stolypin felt impelled to take his part. At the outset it was said that either the Speaker must go or M. Kokofftseff. Then the Prime Minister penned a letter to the former threatening to resign unless the Speaker and the Duma gave way and amends were made to the Finance Minister. Thereupon the Duma, fearing to lose the Premier's services, yielded the point and the Speaker made a public apology, although he had but followed, he said, the dictates of his conscience. Now the first and second Dumas could not move any Minister to vacate his post. The third is all powerful in this respect. Its creator, M. Stolypin, acts as though he were minded to stay in office only so long as he possesses the confidence of the Duma. By this letter and the attitude it revealed, the Prime Minister offered a complete refutation of his colleague's winged phrase: "Thank God we have no parliament." The Duma, he seems to say, is a real parliament, and his own tactics are undeniably those of parliamentary government.

The most eloquent liberal orator has recognised the progress made by the Duma towards government by party. In a speech delivered on 11th May, M. Maklakoff exclaimed: "We see that here 'the third Duma has lost none of its rights, that *it is systematically extending them*, and we applaud it in this rôle." That is an exact statement of fact. And how effectually the Prime Minister co-operates with the Parliament may be gathered from the rapidity with which M. Stolypin cunningly transferred to the head of the Cabinet the jurisdiction over temporary Governors-General from the Monarch, in whose exclusive possession it had been down to 16th July, 1906. These officials are provincial dictators, whose power over liberty and life is unquestioned.

The first Duma, having complained that this power had been grossly abused, was officially told in reply that temporary Governors-General were responsible to none of the Tsar's subjects; they acted on their discretion. On 16th July, 1906, Deputy Minister Makaroff, discussing the execution of men without trial, by order of temporary Governors-General, stated that he would and could render no account of their acts because—they were not answerable to the Home Office, but constituted a perfectly independent source of authority in those places where martial law was proclaimed. But now—in May, 1908—that same Deputy Minister has a different tale to tell.

He has assured the Duma that the Prime Minister now possesses and has wielded full power and authority to issue orders to temporary Governors-General, to see that they are carried out and to dismiss them if he thinks fit. Within two short years, then, one of the chief prerogatives of the Tsar has been deftly appropriated by the chief Minister, who further makes his tenure of office conditional on the good will of the majority of the Chamber. - If this is not the beginning of parliamentary government, what is?

M. Stolypin and the Duma will be heartily congratulated by all proselytising Liberals on the revolutions they have thus bloodlessly engineered. The only drawback is that constitutionalism is confined to the Tavrida Palace; it is not, it cannot be, engrafted on the nation. And herein lies the tragic fatality of the situation.

E. J. DILLON.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. CHRIST IN ENGLISH LITERATURE. By "MUSEUS" ...	1
2. REVIEWS	5
OMNIA EXEUNT IN MYSTERIUM. A SCHOOL FOR MOTHERS.	
LORD ACTON'S ESSAYS AND STUDIES. MR. GOSSE'S NEW VOLUME.	
HUGO WOLF. THE MODERN READER'S BIBLE.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS: William Jordan, Junior, etc.	18
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS	23
5. NOTES	30

CHRIST IN ENGLISH LITERATURE.

WITHIN every great literature a vital, evolving force exists which determines the limits, the form and the spirit of that literature. It may be, but is not necessarily, a religious force. It may be a philosophic determinism, coupled with a vivid sense of congruity and beauty, as in Greek literature. It may be a concrete sense of morality as a force making for national greatness and imperial possibilities, as in Latin literature. But some such force there must be, determining phase after phase of literary effort, through agents often enough unconscious of the spirit that moves them, and sometimes acting in positive revolt against that spirit. In so far as a national literature is a living thing, something separated like a personality from all other literatures, it is the possessor of a secret soul, of an inner self that was with it from the beginning, fashioning its growth and formulating its spiritual tendencies.

English literature is no exception to such a rule, and it may be boldly claimed that Christ—the Christ of the Gospels, of the Fathers, of the Churches—that Christ in all His infinite manifestations to the mind and imagination of man is the evolving force and secret soul of English literature. It is a claim that may, nay will, be contested, possibly with bitterness; but it is a claim that meets the necessary conditions in a way that no other national force can meet them. The national genius, indeed, is essentially religious, and not the less so that its forms of religion are not writ in marble, and its religious expression reveals in "les variations" that Bossuet so eloquently and so foolishly condemned.

The outward tests to be applied in order to establish the claim that Christ is the secret soul of English literature are tests of fact and history, but it may be admitted at once that tests of this kind cannot

finally conclude the matter. The literary use of Christian material does not in itself establish the proposition. There are certain other conditions that have to be met. A national literature is a national fact, playing its part both in the spiritual development of the race and in its moral, mental and material advancement. Can we say that in the case of English literature its informing spirit has brought the Christian ideal into national life? Literary forms are not sufficient to establish this. In Greek literature the literary form was largely religious, yet in so far as religion was concerned the form was not the manifestation of a religious spirit. The spirit was æsthetic, philosophic, political. The Gods were not incarnate, moving among men, determining the social tendencies and inner lives of mighty peoples. On the other hand, in Hebrew literature the form and the spirit was religious. "In the Lord put I my trust . . . The Lord is "in His holy temple; the Lord His throne is in Heaven; His eyes "behold, His eyelids try, the children of men." Throughout Hebrew literature the presence of God is the ceaseless source of inspiration, and as the forms of religion fall away, when we find that there is a fear even to mention the sacred name, the inspiration grows more and more intense until at last the pent-up flower-bud breaks its sheath and bursts into the full blossom of Christian revelation and literature.

In the case of English literature we have therefore a two-fold class of tests to apply. First, we must look at the form of the literature as it evolves from Saxon times; and, secondly, we must consider the effect of those forms on national life as that, too, evolves. Such a task can but be indicated here. Indeed, to fulfil such a task would in itself be a substantial contribution to literature. But the lines of the investigation may be indicated. Consider the dim origins of English literature, the far-off voices of Caedmon and Cynewulf. We find them weaving into the heathen chorus of the West the subtle influences of Christ. Moreover, we have the old Hebraic religious intensity projected into our literature. We are told that for Cynewulf, "Earth's "crammed with heaven, and every common bush afire with God." It was a fit beginning for a famous forthfaring. We may pass at once to the only supreme writer of the period before Alfred—the great Bede. With him the Christian spirit develops: Christ is all in all, and from his cell that spirit seems to gather strength for its work in literature during the long fruitful centuries to come. Dr. Montague James points out that it is in his great "Ecclesiastical History" "that "the wonderful scene is described in which Edwin of Northumbria "takes counsel with his nobles as to the acceptance or rejection of the "Gospel preached by Paulinus; and here occurs the unforgettable "simile of the sparrow flying out of the winter night into the brightly-lighted hall, and out again into the dark." Not less notable than this aspect of literature is Cuthbert's famous description of Bede's last hours: "The time for me to be set free is at hand, for indeed my soul

"much desires to behold my King Christ in His beauty." One seems to see in these two expressions of the same mind—first of the soul as a bird passing from the firelight of life into the dark, and next of the soul passing from that firelight into the sunlight of Christ—a prophecy of the progress of English literature with its alternating hopes and fears as the spirit gives it utterance.

It would not be possible here to review in detail the gradual growth of the Christian ideal in early English literature, or even its manifestation in Gower or Chaucer. But students of the latter writer, the chief glory of mediæval literature, and always an immortal light of all literature, will remember how intimate is his acquaintance with the Gospels and the Epistles, and how tenderly he touches the secrets of true religion, separating it from the husks ere, like a bitter wind, he scatters these from the courts of poetic praise. His ideal is that of Christian love and charity; he turns from bitterness and scoffing, jest and merriment, to the "Crownèd A," and sets forth the ideal priest in deathless words—

Cristes law and His Apostles twelve

He taught, but first he followed it himselfe.

But Chaucer is the lilyed height of mediæval literature. Below him slope after slope are fields flowering everywhere with the same thoughts of Christ as the motive power of all that is best in personal and national life. In so far as literature was a national force before the Reformation and the Renaissance it was a Christian force. Arthur was the ideal hero of the Middle Ages because he was the Christlike Knight; or, rather let us say, the Middle Ages enshrined their social and political ideals in a Christlike Knight.

But does the force of Christ as the secret soul of English literature fail when we reach the adolescence of Western Europe, as manifested in the Renaissance or the Reformation? Was it, after all, a childlike thing of beauty destined to fade in the light of common day? There can be but one answer to such a question. If Shakespeare may be taken as the representative and glorious leader of that whole choir of singing birds who had their flight of song in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we see at once that Christ in English literature was manifesting new power with the new birth of learning, and was broadening national life and aspiration. People sometimes discuss the personal creed of the greatest man in all literature. Had he disclosed this or that peculiar or local variation of the Christian creed, then "the less Shakespeare he." What he did was of the universal type of act. He projected all that was best of "Holy Church" from its mediæval environment into that of the New Age. Religion to him was a thing too deep for tears; its old forms, its ancient splendours, all appealed to his artistic powers; its real force underlay the magic of his

revelations. It was not for him to write mystery plays and identify himself with the past or to write epics foretelling the future. His work was to take the principles of Christianity and weave them into the other forces lying in the root depths of the human nature that he observed around him with so curious and penetrating an eye. His plays are instinct with Christian forces and are adorned with Christian literary forms drawn from the formulæ of the Church or the very words of the Gospels. Hence it is that his works have become, not only what they must have become in any event, immortal works of art, but also national forces making for personal and national righteousness as such righteousness is understood in Christian lands.

If we admit this of Shakespeare, the whole claim for Christ as the secret soul or evolving force of English literature must be admitted. It is needless to refer to the great names of Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning; to enumerate the endless list of prose writers and poets who have been since the end of the seventeenth century the agents and formative material of this force. It is nothing against this claim that there have been great writers such as Gibbon, great poets such as Shelley and Keats, who have either revolted from or ignored or failed to understand the forces that were moulding society in their own day and generation. In so far as their ideals and their revolt from established forms and ideas were permanent, they were the result of revolutionary forces that were in fact, if not in form, the necessary results of an awakening Christianity. It was no mere chance that made Tennyson choose Arthur as the central figure of his great epic. The Arthur of the New Age was not less significant than the Arthur of mediæval times. He once again represented the ideal of national and personal life as seen by the seers of literature, and so literature reacted once again on national life and made the Christian ideal part of that life.

One other word remains to be said: If Christ has been the secret soul of English literature from the beginning He will be with it to the end. In that fact lies the hope of any anticipated revival in literary power. Some observers are pleased to declare that English literature has reached its appointed bound. The same thing might have been said in the late fifteenth century when the New Learning had almost come. Another Renaissance, another impulse in the fields of life, religion and literature is at hand. We feel it dimly on every side. The world is quite other than the world where men now middle-aged were born. The New Science has transformed the outlook as the New Learning transformed it four centuries ago. We have to-day new mysteries on every hand and after all it is *mysteries* that inspire literature. The poet looks forth from his lone peak and peers deep into the future; the prose writer pens his periods in praise of the new world looming into sight beyond the mysterious bounds of mist that encompass this present age. The spirit that has all through inspired

English literature must still inspire it. The perfect stature of our literature is not yet; the evolving force has not yet completed its work; the secret soul has manifestations still to make that shall not only glorify the form of literature, but intensify its force as a vivifying influence among nations and among men.

MUSEUS.

REVIEWS.

OMNIA EXEUNT IN MYSTERIUM*

It would be idle to deny that such supreme mysteries of the Christian faith as the revealed existence of the Trinity in Unity, and the historical assertion as to the Virgin Birth of our Lord, have occasioned and will always occasion doubts and difficulties even to earnest believers, and have provided and will still provide a platform of attack for serious as well as superficial critics of the faith. Such doubts, difficulties and attacks are in the nature of the case. We feel so completely at home with our inner selves, so familiar with the world that we live in and the starry universe that envelops us, so persuaded that seeing is believing and touching is faith, that the supreme mysteries of life evade us. Man himself is a mystery coming whence one knows not, but certainly out of mystery, going whither one knows not, but certainly into mystery, and living here in the midst of mysteries scarcely more tolerable than his whence and whither. Atoms of consciousness that we are, we have learnt one thing only, and not even this with perfect certainty: That the universe, so far as we can conceive it, is a rational progression of things, that it is orderly in structure and phenomena, that like causes in like conditions are followed by like effects. But *why* are we here; *what* does it all mean; is there a goal? These are questions that we ask, and necessarily ask in vain, from the processes of logic or the investigation of things. Mr. Illingworth, in his remarkable and inspiring work on the "Doctrine of the Trinity," puts this point with penetrating clearness:—

Why do we exist? Human nature as it pursues what we call its ordinary course from generation to generation has always this question at heart. It so essentially and inevitably rises within us, from the very make and constitution of our minds, that we may reasonably say that we were created to ask it. And if, in a rationally ordered world, we were created to ask it, we must conclude that we were created to be answered. And that answer, by its very character, must come from outside ourselves. Since, therefore, it is natural for us to ask this question, and natural to expect its answer, we cannot call the question

* (1) "The Doctrine of the Trinity Apologetically Considered," by J. R. Illingworth M.A., D.D. (Macmillan and Co., Ltd., price 6s.) (2) "The Virgin Birth of Christ," by James Orr, M.A., D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the United Free Church College, Glasgow (Hodder and Stoughton, price 6s.).

unnatural merely because it comes in what we think an unusual way. On the contrary, if the Incarnation is the answer, as Christians believe it to be, it may be every whit as natural, to a wider view, as the natural question which it meets, both alike being parts of one ordered whole.

Accepting this position, we have a perfect right to examine with no *à priori* predilections the evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity, and to conclude that "the vital essence of what came to be called the "doctrine of the Trinity was revealed by Christ Himself as God "Incarnate." We can trace both the assertions of the Trinity and of the Incarnation in their unvarying substantial form back to within ten years of their origin. But the importance of this continuous tradition of a great society does not stop here. The connection is too close to allow of the explanation of a gradual deification of Christ or of the intrusion of the doctrine from the East, the Triads of India or Egypt. The superficial resemblance between the Indian or Egyptian conception and that which Christ Himself enumerated vanishes on close examination. "In a word, it was not invented but revealed." Mr. Illingworth ably and at great length shows how helpful to the conception of a God is the doctrine which, if true, we should expect to find, as we do find, adumbrated in the universe of thought and social life. Moreover, the actual conception of God becomes in a sense possible. The absoluteness of God makes it impossible for us to conceive the object that must, if God is a Person, exist as an object of experience to which the Creator stands as subject. This cannot be the universe, for that would imply God's oneness with His universe—the doctrine of Pantheism—or would imply His dependence on an object outside Himself, in which event He is not absolute. This difficulty was discussed by Plato and Aristotle. As soon as the Christian conception of the Trinity arose "it was a revelation at once "of the possibility and the reality of what philosophy said must be ;—"relations in the Godhead, which do not disturb Its absoluteness, "because they are internal to Itself." Mr. Illingworth finely applies this dry, metaphysical conception to the special case of the moral absoluteness of God. The doctrine of the Trinity enables us to think of God "existing in a mode of which the family, the unit of society, is the "created and faint reflection."

And so it becomes possible to conceive of the various relations which constitute righteousness, and especially of love, in which they culminate, as internal to the Godhead; and of holiness, therefore, as the eternal, essential characteristic of God; and the consequent source of that "categorical imperative," that awful, unqualified, absolute authority with which the moral law addresses the conscience of mankind. "Ye shall therefore be holy: for I am holy." "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

The doctrine of the Trinity, in a word, lessens our intellectual difficulties when we regard the mysterious universe that is within us

and around us. But its practical power over the lives of men in the conceptions of the Holy Spirit brooding over the development of man, of the Fatherhood of God loving all men, of the Incarnation of Christ, is still more important than its intellectual value. It not only in part answers our questions, but it magnifies our lives.

The question of the Virgin Birth is in reality only a minor part of the great problem considered so elaborately in Mr. Illingworth's book. Its chief importance is that it is made a point of attack on the authenticity of the Gospels that contain the doctrine. As Dr. Orr points out in his very able and learned work on the subject: "The great bulk of the opposition comes from those who do not recognise 'a supernatural element in Christ's life at all.' The *à priori* assumption of the impossibility of this or any other miracle in fact dispenses with any question of evidence. But we have dealt above with the *à priori* assumption. *Omnia exeunt in mysterium.* Like Bede's sparrow we pass from the lighted hall into the dark. We have, therefore, a right to consider evidence, and the moment that we do so the evidence for the Virgin Birth is un rebuttable. Not only have we two independent versions, but there are "mutually complementary narratives of the Virgin Birth of our Lord," and every authority that can be brought to bear on the problem shows that these narratives are "indubitably genuine parts of their respective Gospels." The attacks of the most powerful critics have left these passages intact as the most ancient portions of the Gospels, and we have for all time in our possession the story of the Birth given us by St. Matthew from the standpoint of Joseph, and by St. Luke from the standpoint of Mary. Nor do we stand alone even with those conclusive narratives. St. John certainly (vii. 41, 42) assumes the Birth to have taken place in Bethlehem, and there are many passages in St. Paul's Epistles which only become clearly explicable on the assumption of St. Paul's knowledge of the miraculous origin of our Lord. The witness of Old Testament prophecy in considering this question cannot be disregarded, but the fact of highest importance next to the Gospel narratives is that the miraculous origin of Christ was no gradual evolution of the Church, but stands in its fullest form in the earliest days and in the Apostles' Creed.

It is good to face, especially at this season of the year, these fundamental mysteries of the Christian faith, and having done all to be able frankly to believe that Christ was born in Bethlehem in the manner that the ancient records say. All things when we come to an ultimate analysis fade away from us into a world of mystery. But faith can illuminate that world and make us see that these mysteries which our minds cannot solve, and which yet are not contrary to reason, are, if accepted, in themselves instruments for solving those mysteries of sin and pain and death which are not only mysterious but heart-desolating.

A SCHOOL FOR MOTHERS.*

Christmas is the festival of family life: "And they came with haste and found both Mary and Joseph, and the Babe lying in the manger." "And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary His mother, and fell down and worshipped Him." The simplest of men and the wisest of men alike turned from their ways to view with "long, long thoughts" the norm of civilisation. The sacredness of Babyhood had received its new, its final sanction, "and the child grew and waxed strong." But it is in the same season that we read of the slaughter of the Innocents, of Rachel weeping for her children because they are not. The same tragedy is before our eyes to-day, the tragic incongruity of the worship and the slaughter of the child. Our human nature and our faith, our mind and our hearts alike turn shuddering from the spectacle and from that grim Herod whom we call Ignorance. Here and now the conscience of Christianity is calling out for help: and the answer still delays. But that conscience must not lull itself to sleep with its own answer, with the cry that the problem is insoluble. It is soluble, but not without work, not without money, and not without, above all things, Christianity.

A word must be said as to the scope of the problem. In his admirable report on the health of Greenwich for the year 1906 Dr. Annis has dealt with the awful question of the death-rate of children in London. That death-rate for the whole county of London was 130 deaths of children under one year of age in every 1,000 births registered, while the average death-rate of persons of all ages was 15.1 per 1,000 persons living. The total number of deaths in London in 1906 was 71,155, and of these about 16,300 were of infants under one year. That the great army of children annually sacrificed by Ignorance is, so far as at least 10,000 children are concerned, avoidable is shown by the varying death-rate, which proceeds from 79 per 1,000 births in St. Marylebone to 169 in Shoreditch. But local variations bring out this point more clearly. In Greenwich the variations were from 48 per 1,000 births in Kidbrooke to 207 in St. Nicholas. The difference broadly represents the goal that can be reached. Of every four infants that die three under the best conditions of environment and knowledge would survive. One may estimate that in the British Isles during the last ten years at least 1,000,000 infant lives have been thrown away.

There, then, is the problem: the saving of 100,000 British lives per annum. If these lives were lost by the plague there would be no recurrence of the disaster. A mighty dread would smite the

* "A School for Mothers," by Evelyn M. Bunting, Dora E. L. Bunting, M.B., B.S., Annie E. Barnes, and Blanche Gardiner, B.A., with an Introduction by Sir Thomas Barlow, Bart., K.C.V.O., M.D., and a Chapter by Dr. J. F. J. Sykes, M.O.H. (Horace Marshall and Son, price 1s. net).

* The Annual Report made to the Council of the Metropolitan Borough of Greenwich for the year 1906, by Dr. E. G. Annis, M.O.H. (Messrs. E. G. Berryman and Sons, Greenwich).

community and they would work hand to hand. The present danger is more dreadful, for it discloses a moral plague that is destroying not only children but souls.

No doubt the excellent programme put forward by the National Conference on Infantile Mortality, held at Westminster, in June, 1906, may become effective one day. We cannot wait. There is a more excellent, because a more immediate, way, and we recommend it to that vast army of unemployed women of the richer classes who at present seem to have no field in which to serve their country and their God. It is the way of the "School for Mothers." The mother who does not buy this book must be very poor or very unwise. The story that it tells has lessons for the richest nursery as well as the poorest garret. It is the story of a noble and successful experiment.

Social problems, like physical problems, must be solved not only by grand generalisations, but by experiments that reveal the inward structure of things. The "School for Mothers" has been making these vital experiments since last June. The following circular issued to the public concerned by means of 38 mothers' meetings and health visitors conveys the general idea of the scheme:—

BRING YOUR BABY TO BE WEIGHED! Mothers and Babies Welcome, 6, Chalton Street, Euston Road (for babies under 12 months of age). HOURS FOR WEIGHING, ETC., Tuesdays and Fridays from 2.15 to 3.30 o'clock. The lady doctor attends to weigh babies and mothers, and to give advice on their feeding, clothing, and general management. If baby is not increasing in weight there is something wrong. Cases of illness are referred to doctors, dispensaries or hospitals. WELCOME CLUB. 1D. PER WEEK. Mothers are invited, with their Babies, to join the club, and come regularly once a fortnight, on Tuesdays or Fridays. There are also talks and lessons on health, cooking, sewing, etc., on other days. Girls over school age may attend as visitors. DINNERS FOR NURSING MOTHERS. Dinners for expectant and nursing mothers—to be eaten at the Club—are provided on medical recommendation at a charge of 1½d. a day every day except Sunday, from 1.30 to 3 o'clock.

This school and club began its work on June 4th, 1907, with four babies to be weighed and two women to dinner. The scheme was an immediate success. "*Ladies from all parts offered their services.*" We italicise this all-important quotation. The three ends in view are the education of the mother, the encouragement of breast feeding, the provision of a suitable substitute where breast feeding is impossible. Artificial feeding is a monstrous evil unless it is a physical necessity. Sir Thomas Barlow, in the illuminating introduction which commends "The School for Mothers," dwells on "the depraved social influences"—the pleasure-loving husband, the fashion-plate lady friends, the idle and fashionable monthly nurse—that bring this monstrous evil about in rich circles; and this great physician knows

what he is writing about. These parasitic influences happily do not cumber the working classes; but the pressure of daily work and the temptation of lying advertisements of patent foods lead in innumerable cases to hand feeding. Dr. Sykes, the experienced Medical Officer of Health for St. Paneras, emphatically condemns it, and he, too, knows what he is writing about, for the infant death-rate in St. Pancras is 131 per 1,000. The problem of reducing that death-rate centres round the mother both before and after confinement, and the "School for Mothers" is attacking this problem in the only way that can secure anything like success. If we can educate the mothers and the landlords, the future of England will be bright indeed. Let all those who would play their part in this great movement buy this book and help to form a School for Mothers in their own parish. Let it be the task of the New Year.

* * * *

LORD ACTON'S ESSAYS AND STUDIES.*

These two volumes form a substantial addition to the definitive edition of Lord Acton's works, and it is with a sense of gratitude that we record this further contribution by Mr. Figgis and Mr. Lawrence to that edition. We may doubt if in any part of his published works the particular genius of Lord Acton is so well exhibited as in these volumes. Here we have in the voluminous and illuminating essays on liberty the germ that might have developed into that work on the history of liberty which it was the dream of his life to write. These essays, so rich in actual material, and richer still in fecundity of ideas, contain all the principles that would have been elaborated in the completed work. They are only less valuable than that history would have been. They give us in ample and overflowing measure a conception of the evolution of political freedom that places Lord Acton finally among the great historians of the world. The two addresses delivered to the members of the Bridgnorth Institution, at the Agricultural Hall, on the 26th February and the 28th May, 1877, on the "History of Freedom in Antiquity" and the "History of Freedom in Christianity," are as perfect in form and execution as they are in abundance of thought and suggestion. Lord Acton may not appeal to some of us in his own excursions into the fields of economics and politics, and it would be vain to deny that the publication of his letters to Miss Mary Gladstone strengthened the belief that the stage of action is no place for the historian. But no such disillusionment can overtake us here where we watch this master mind unrolling before us the record of fundamental events in the

* (1) "The History of Freedom, and Other Essays," by John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, first Baron Acton. Edited, with an Introduction, by John Neville Figgis and Reginald Vere Laurence. Macmillan and Co. Price 10s. net.

* (2) "Historical Essays and Studies," by John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, first Baron Acton. Edited by John Neville Figgis and Reginald Vere Laurence. Macmillan and Co. Price 10s. net.

history of freedom, and exhibiting causes and principles nakedly at play. The essay on "Political Thoughts on the Church" shows him at less advantage, with something of the Catholic peering through the eyes of the historian, but in the addresses of 1877 the personal equation of opinion has disappeared, and we only see the personality of the writer in the fineness of his style, the profundity of his learning and the grave irony of his mind. His nobility of note is struck in such phrases as: "Liberty is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end"; "no prescription is valid against the conscience of mankind"; "a nation can never abandon its fate to an authority it cannot control." The chief glory of the United States was that it even "surrounded the popular will with restrictions." The quarterly essay on "Sir Erskine May's Democracy in Europe" attains the same high level of literature, and combines learning with criticism in a way quite unknown to earlier critics. In these notable essays there are phrases that haunt the mind. "Few discoveries," he declares, "are more irritating than those which expose the pedigree of ideas." The definition of Socialism as "the infirmity that attends mature democracies" is so true and wise, so absolutely based on history, that it makes the mind wonder why statesmen read so little history. His declaration that the rapid decline of Athenian liberty was due to an age "which possessed no fixed standard of right and wrong" is matter enough for reflection in another age that is attacking all standards; while his belief that "the code of Justinian became the greatest obstacle, next to feudalism, with which liberty had to contend" is a serious thought in a period that is turning again from the natural evolution of law to the fixity of codes. It is, however, a little curious that so keen an observer as Lord Acton did not, apparently, notice the enormous influence that the juridical conceptions of Thomas Hobbes have had on modern political institutions. Locke is not a force to-day, while every hour we seem to approach nearer to the sombre ideal depicted by the friend of Bacon and Selden.

It is not possible here to write in detail of these essays with their marvellous range of subjects. A considerable portion of the first volume deals with the conflict with the Vatican in the third quarter of the last century. That conflict seems to us to have had great influence on Lord Acton's wise outlook on the relationship of faith and politics. The well-written introduction to this volume shows us many aspects of the historian and the part that his intense Liberalism played in his struggles with the ultramontane horror which checked in so terrible a fashion the natural and noble evolution of the Roman Church. One can only wonder what he would have thought of the latest development of the ultramontane spirit, with its puerile utterances against modern thought and progress.

The second volume of essays is of the same high standard as the

first. The monograph on "Wolsey and the Divorce of Henry VIII." is a brilliant, learned, and perfectly unbiassed account of one of the most pregnant events that the world has seen. The inner history of the whole matter is exhibited in a fashion that demonstrates Lord Acton's almost miraculous acquaintance with the original authorities in this difficult period of history. This volume contains many essays on quite modern history—dealing with the Revolution, Napoleon the Great, Talleyrand's Memoirs, the Mexican Empire, Cavour, the Franco-Prussian War and England between 1837 and 1880.

Lord Acton, despite much admixture of Continental blood and his intimate relations with foreign scholars and statesmen, was first to last an Englishman, and as an Englishman he was glad to dwell on the great qualities that, in his considered belief, distinguish this nation and carry it on from generation to generation untouched by the social and political change and decay that affect the continents East and West. Nowhere does he express this view more clearly than in the conclusion of his essay on the "History of Freedom in Christianity." He writes as follows:—

I do not like to conclude without inviting attention to the impressive fact that so much of the hard fighting, the thinking, the enduring that has contributed to the deliverance of man from the power of man, has been the work of our countrymen, and of their descendants in other lands. . . . All those explanations [of this phenomenon] lie on the surface, and are as visible as the protecting ocean; but they can only be successive effects of a constant cause which must lie in the same native qualities of perseverance, moderation, individuality, and the manly sense of duty, which give to the English race its supremacy in the stern art of labour, which has enabled it to thrive as no other can on inhospitable shores, and which (although no great people has less of the bloodthirsty craving for glory and an army of 50,000 English soldiers has never been seen in battle) caused Napoleon to exclaim, as he rode away from Waterloo, "It has always been the same since Crecy." Therefore if there is reason for pride in the past, there is more for hope in the time to come.

Such a judgment from one who was quite unblinded by insularity is a hopeful message in an age when the qualities of our race are doubted by politicians busy devising remedies for imagined evils in commerce. It were better to take up the Napoleonic cry and believe that with England "it has always been the same since Crecy."

* * * *

MR. GOSSE'S NEW VOLUME.*

In this fascinating book Mr. Edmund Gosse, who, though he does not give his name, makes no effort to conceal his identity, tells the story of his early life. Most autobiographies rouse our suspicion. The feelings of childhood are so often blurred by later reflection as

* "Father and Son," by Edmund Gosse (William Heinemann, price 8s. 6d. net).

well as by the crowd of later events. But this story reads true, and the author insists that his memory is clear and accurate; indeed, the very monotony of his first years and the tremendous force of the religious thought which controlled them must have engraved very deep impressions on his mind. . .

Mr. Gosse's parents were extreme Puritans of the sect of the Plymouth Brethren. Highly intelligent and intellectual—his father was a distinguished naturalist—they threw their whole souls into Calvinistic theology and the training in it of their only child. There are great numbers of persons still living who have been emancipated as they grew up from the severe stress of that line of thought—some successfully, by a gradual broadening of view, some half wrecked by the violence of a revolt. Mr. Gosse rightly says that his father and himself represent two epochs. The one was possessed by the idea of the authority of God; the other is inspired by the revelation of His love. Both elements go to make a sound religion; the neglect of each has great dangers. This generation is casting about for the genuine foundation of authority. The religious training of a generation ago had no difficulty about authority: what it lacked was the sense of human freedom and development. The restrictions of religious life were cramping; but, after all, the great rules and habits of duty were kept impressed, and we have yet to see whether the more gracious methods of our own day will produce great characters and masters of life. The writer of this book speaks of his parents with affectionate reverence, though with great freedom, and his own story is one of emancipation rather than revolt, though, when he came to years of discretion, and his strong tastes for literature and art had scope, he was clearly obliged to assert his freedom with a firmness which could not but cause pain.

We have not space to tell the story. Childish religion, especially when very pronounced, has a humorous side, and the author gives some very funny accounts of his early exploits. It is quite unnecessary for him to half apologise for them. Strong religion nourishes humour. There are no better tellers of stories than Christian ministers whose vocation has led them to see much of the common people, and no better stories than those which gather about the strong religious feelings of the people. Was it Coleridge who said that a man never really believed in his religion until he could joke about it?

So when Mr. Gosse tells us of the day when, as a boy, having learnt from the Old Testament that the greatest of sins was idolatry, which consisted in bowing down to things of wood and stone, and being led on by curiosity put a chair on the table, knelt down and said his prayers to it, and then watched the sky in vain for any token of the Divine displeasure, we smile and go back to some ideas of our own childhood. But few of us have been so deeply read in controversial

theology as this: Mr. Gosse, to his deep sorrow, lost his mother early, and after some years his father married again. He broke the news of the coming of a new mamma one morning to the little boy to whom the lady was known. The child took it gravely enough, and after more questions affecting himself and the Christian character of the newcomer said: "But, papa, don't tell me that she is a Pædo-baptist!"

We welcome this book as a genuine and very interesting piece of religious history, a picture of an epoch which lingers in the less conspicuous past of society, but represents—with exaggeration—some elements of life and thought which are perennial. There will always be a tragic as well as a humorous side to religion.

* * * *

HUGO WOLF.*

The literature of music has increased amazingly within the last few years, but there should still be plenty of room for the "New Library of Music" which Messrs. Methuen are producing under the able editorship of Mr. Ernest Newman. The series is to comprise biographical works on a considerably more elaborate scale than any previous undertakings of the same kind, and is designed to supply the student with the latest achievements of modern research and analysis. There are also to be included historical studies of different art-forms and critical surveys of various kinds. Four volumes are already announced. Three of these are on accepted divinities by accepted worshippers—Mozart, by W. H. Hadow; Beethoven, by D. F. Tovey; Händel, by R. A. Streatfield. None of these, however, are yet ready for publication. Mr. Newman appropriately enough opens the ball himself, but it is doubtful if the subject of the inaugural volume, Hugo Wolf, is as appropriate to the ceremony as its author. Those at least who accept Mr. Newman's estimate of Wolf will not question the discretion of his choice. Mr. Newman has no hesitation in putting him "at the head of the song writers of the world. He surpasses them all to the same extent and for the same reasons that Wagner surpasses all other musical dramatists." Mr. Newman makes the reason of this judgment quite clear. The function of a song writer, he says, is to express his poet as completely as possible, not only in spirit but in actual detail. The melodic line of the voice must never conflict with the proper emphasis of the verbal structure, any more than the spirit of the composition with the spirit of the poem. No previous song writer, not even Schubert or Schumann, has attained this ideal as perfectly as Wolf. They have all at times written the music of their songs *as music*, and not as expression. Worse still, they have sometimes lapsed into musical formulæ—general and conventional expressions

* "Hugo Wolf," by Ernest Newman. New Library of Music (Messrs. Methuen and Co.)

of the emotions they are endeavouring to represent, not vital and exact reproductions of the particular poems under treatment. Another field for the energies of the composer is the accompaniment, which may be as eloquent as, even more eloquent than the vocal part itself. Comments, reminiscences, foreshadowings, atmosphere, all have their place in it. Here, also, Mr. Newman finds Wolf pre-eminent, and he attributes to him besides an unrivalled adaptability and intensity of utterance and an almost Shakespearian breadth of conception. No one who has heard Wolf's string quartet in D Minor and the few songs of his that find their way to our concert platforms can fail to be struck with the wonderful delicacy and precision of his art, but the bulk of his work is not yet known in England, and it is therefore not easy to combat a champion so ardent and well equipped as Mr. Newman. One may, however, accept his statement of Wolf's ideals and technical achievements (it is well supported by musical quotations), and still differ from his conclusions. In the first place, one may challenge his thesis (a vital one for his position) that a composer can render a particular scene "as definite and unmistakable to the ear as a painter would to the eye." That is the fallacy which underlies much modern music. When there is added a meticulous attention to the expression of detail, and a tendency to crowd the accompaniment with independent significance, the breadth, unity and intrinsic beauty which are the essentials of great song writing are in danger of disappearing.

Music, to attain its highest development, must (even in the song) be to some extent written for itself. Any subordination of it to the expression of definite things is *pro tanto* a degradation, and one should be careful therefore that the loss is always compensated by the gain, bearing in mind that, as a song is made to be sung, its effects should be broad enough to succeed on a first hearing. Schumann and Schubert, where they strayed, strayed in the direction of pure music. We are in danger of the opposite error, and one may doubt if Wolf, for all his genius of insight and interpretation, has sufficient breadth and purity of expression to rank permanently with the demigods.

Mr. Newman writes throughout most clearly and forcibly, and with a genuine enthusiasm for his subject. In the biographical part of his book he gives an admirable picture of Wolf's unhappy and struggling life, and of his strange spasmodic mind, now plunged in the depths of gloom and sterility, now in a fever of creative exaltation. Interesting, too, is his description of modern musical Vienna, as full of intrigue as it was when Salieri and Anfossi drove Mozart to Prague, and as torn by schism as was London in the great days of Händel and Buononcini.

Altogether Mr. Newman's book is one of great interest and should secure the series a most favourable reception.

THE MODERN READER'S BIBLE.*

Professor Moulton has completed a notable work with the issue of this remarkable edition of the Revised Version of the Bible. This is not one of the modernised editions of the text that pain alike eye and ear and the sense of reverence. Here we have, save in some quite inconsiderable verbal details, the text as issued in 1881 after the great Revision. No doubt that text is far from perfect. It was a compromise, an endeavour to pour the maximum of accurate translation into the ancient vessel of the Authorised Version. From the point of view of translation, apart from tradition and perfection of prose style, it is possible that a more accurate version will one day appear. But that is not Professor Moulton's aim. His book is at first sight of an even more mechanical nature.

Its scheme has been, accepting for translation the results of our Revisers, to investigate, from internal evidence of the writings themselves, and by principles of comparative literature, the exact literary form and detailed structure of the books of Scripture; and then to use all the devices of modern printing for the purpose of indicating such structure to the eye of the reader. Introductions to the books, and notes, have been added, but these are secondary; the page setting, if only it is correct, is itself the best of commentaries.

Such a scheme will, as is pointed out, in two ways bring us nearer the sacred original. It will indicate "the varieties of literary form and structure that distinguish different parts of the Bible," and it will sweep away the structure of verse and unnatural continuity imposed upon it by mediæval commentators. Certainly, if one fact more than another distinguishes our modern outlook upon the Bible it is the regard that we pay to the text. For us it is the text as it came from the inspired minds of its creators that matters. To-day we have a new doctrine of verbal inspiration. If anyone was inspired it was not the mediæval commentator or even the Elizabethan translator. We must get back to the literary form that was in the minds of the men who penned the Scriptures. Professor Moulton truly enough says that "the revelation which is the basis of our modern religion has been made in the form of literature: grasp of its literary structure is the true starting point for spiritual interpretation, and the literary study of the Bible is the common ground on which varying theologies may meet." But we are tempted to part from the Editor at this point. He goes on to say that this edition of the Bible excludes another class of questions conveniently grouped under the title of the Higher Criticism. No doubt it was difficult to avoid this decision, but

* "The Modern Reader's Bible: the Books of the Bible, with three Books of the Apocrypha, presented in Modern Literary Form." Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Richard G. Moulton, M.A. (Camb.), Ph.D. (Dean), Professor of Literary Theory and Interpretation in the University of Chicago (The Macmillan Company). Price 2s. 6d. per vol.

in fact the Higher Criticism goes to the root of the question of literary form. The Higher Criticism is largely concerned with the question of transitions in form, and it may very well be that the present form in the best manuscripts of some books of the Old Testament and of at least one book—Matthew—in the New Testament bears much the same resemblance to the original form as the Authorised Version bears to the manuscripts from which it is translated. We cannot agree that the sphere of the Higher Criticism "is history, not "literature." It is no analogy to say that "Homer remains one and "the same," while our conception of primitive Greece is modified with advancing investigation. The Homer that we have of course remains one and the same, and the Genesis that we have remains one and the same: that is a mere truism. But we are perfectly satisfied to have the Homer that we have, even though we find that it is a late recension of an earlier work; while we should by no means be satisfied under the same circumstances with our present Genesis. We want to get back to the first voices and are not satisfied with intermediate forms, whether they date from 1611 or B.C. 200. It is therefore clear that future editions of this important work will have to incorporate the accepted results of the Higher Criticism.

The Modern Reader's Bible has been for years past slowly winning its way into the mind and heart of the public. During the last twelve years it has appeared volume after volume, each containing some one or other of the canonical works. Here we have twenty-one such volumes drawn together: "The same text, the same introductions and "notes, except, indeed, that I have somewhat enlarged those portions "of the introductions that bear upon the grouping of individual books "into the large divisions of history, poetry, prophecy, wisdom." As it stands this Bible, thanks to a skilful system of arrangement and a use of type that is almost magical, can be read as a continuous narrative in a way that has never before been possible. Dr. Moulton points out that we have in the Bible what he calls a "philosophy of world history," with, as its basis, a Chosen People, the medium of the revelation of God to other nations. We see in the text the growth of this people from the family into an organic theocratic state containing within it the secular germ which gradually evolves until it comes into stern conflict with the theocracy. The secular element becomes triumphant and then fails at the Captivity, which brings the people into touch with other nations. Freed once more "it resumes its career no longer a "Nation, but a Church, profoundly conscious of its world-mission." This mission is taken up by our Lord, and the contact with Rome brings once more the Chosen People into touch with the world, leavening it until the conception of a world-wide kingdom of Christ becomes possible. Regarded in this way the Bible is a world epic, and Dr. Moulton's division of the text and dexterous use of type by which he separates poetry and metrical passages from prose, and

indicates the successive sections of the narrative, enables the reader to grasp the epic idea in its fulness. No doubt much criticism in matters of detail may be and will be poured out upon the method employed, and it is certainly true enough that the Editor is really substituting his own comment for that of the mediæval commentator; but their divisions and titles were for the most part arbitrary, while here we have the scientific mind brought to bear on literary problems. The arrangement of the edition is first to group together under the heading "Bible history" the narrative books from Genesis to Esther. These are followed first by the books of the Prophets, secondly by "Bible Poetry," namely, Psalms, Lamentations and the Song of Songs; thirdly by Bible philosophy—Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, the Wisdom of Solomon and Job. Then follows the New Testament in two groups: first, the continuous history of the primitive Church as represented by the Gospel of St. Luke, the Acts of the Apostles (with the insertion therein at their proper place of the Epistles of St. Paul) and the other epistles; secondly, the remaining three Gospels and the Revelation of St. John. This treatment of the New Testament seems daring enough and certainly open to much criticism. In the case of the Gospels Dr. Moulton has separated what immemorial tradition has grouped together. But the scheme is well thought out and certainly conduces to the main literary end, perfect continuity of narrative, while the elaborate introduction to each book and the full notes always make the Editor's position clear and illuminate the text.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

We have among our younger novelists vigorous story-tellers, expert psychologists, and even some in whom is the spirit of romance, but since Mr. Meredith ceased to write there have been few of larger stature. When, therefore, a writer appears whose horizon seems larger than the stage on which his puppets play, we should make every effort to appreciate his positive achievement, without being deterred by occasional lapse or obscurity. Mr. J. C. Snaith has already put forward a claim to such consideration by his "Broke of Covenden" and "Henry Northcote;" and his new story, "William Jordan, Junior" (Constable and Co., Ltd., Price 6s.), should establish his position. The chief criticism one has to make of the book (which is, in form, a history of the birth and development of a world-poet through the struggles, miseries and humours of a modern city) is that it carries the didactic theory of fiction too far. The value of Mr. Meredith's novels lies almost as much in their exposition of a philosophy as in the actual feats of creation, but that exposition is made almost unconsciously through the medium of the story. In "William Jordan" symbolism and reality have equal prominence. The two elements are, it is true, very well combined, so well indeed that one could almost read the story as a story without bothering one's head about the allegory at all. One

feels, however, in many places, that the artistic achievement would have been greater had the symbolism been a little less conspicuous. Thus it is surely inartistic to treat symbol as actuality, as is done throughout in the matter of the "Book of the Ages." Again the exposition of the allegory in the last chapter but one, though very skilfully introduced and carried out, strikes one as an inartistic emphasis. Moreover, one resents being tied down to Mr. Snaith's interpretation. The whole value of an allegory is in what the reader makes of it, and Mr. Snaith's ideas, like all ideas of substance, are susceptible of more than one application. Of the story, apart from its meaning, it is difficult to speak; the connection between the two is too intimate. The whole presents a series of pictures many of which are both vivid and unforgettable, and makes the most moving and fascinating piece of work that the author has yet given us. The workmanship is still a little unequal; sometimes, as in the incident of Sergeant Dodson's party, one finds observation singularly humorous and exact, while elsewhere, as in the picture of Mr. Octavius Crumpey, Mr. Snaith tends to become extravagant and heavy-handed. One must also remark that the book seems either to have been carelessly written or the proofs ill-corrected. There are many small and irritating blunders. This, however, is a comparatively trifling matter. Whatever the actual faults of this book (and others may find in it more than have been here indicated), it is difficult to leave it without the conviction that Mr. Snaith will one day (it is too early yet to say whether he has already done so) write something of really permanent value.

* * *

M. René Bazin, of the French Academy, has published another of his charming stories *Le Ble qui lève* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 3 fr. 50), one which recalls the book *La Terre qui Meurt* by which he is best known in this country. French novels are too often infested with scenes and topics which spoil to our taste their graces of style. But here is a writer who, in a mood of gentle pensiveness, not only makes us feel the subtle influence of the fields and the forests of his country, but draws fine full-length portraits of the French peasants with their virtues and faults and their deep feelings, and brings us into close touch with their views of society and religion. His hero in this new volume—Gilbert Cloquet—is a true peasant, a farm labourer, strong, energetic, hard-working, and intelligent beyond his fellows. He has suffered misfortune through a frivolous wife and daughter; and after the death of the one and the marriage of the other to an unworthy husband he turns woodcutter in the forest of a decaying noble family, in which the parents are absorbed in Parisian life, while the son, who loves the estate, cultivates the peasants and forms a friendship with Cloquet. This situation enables M. Bazin to describe the general irreligion of the wood-cutters and their fanatical hatred of the nobles. Cloquet, not sharing in these feelings, though not a religious man himself, and eager for a more just treatment of the poor, is frowned on and practically driven out by his class, and ultimately removes into Picardy, where he works on a large farm; and we see another side of rural life. Becoming deeply dissatisfied with himself, and longing for peace of mind, he finds salvation in three days' retreat at a Jesuit establishment in Belgium, just over the frontier. M. Bazin, who is obviously a sincere Catholic, paints a contrast between the rebellious and atheistic workmen and the pious

one. The book, however, is by no means controversial, and the points are delicately touched and brought out always in a strong personal setting. There is a delightful picture of a *curé*, disappointed at the non-success of his village ministry, but, when commanded by his bishop to collect throughout his parish, to make good the loss of stipend through the Separation Law, finds the response of his poor flock much more sympathetic than he expected. As a study of the peasant thoughts and social conditions of modern France this book is of deep interest; to praise its style and feeling would be superfluous. As the scenes turn we do not think it maintains the touch of *La Terre qui Meurt*.

* \ *

One is always apt to regard a treatise on a living author as something of an impertinence. He can, one feels, explain himself, and it is for his readers to appraise him. For an individual to undertake either task is like praising a man's children in his presence. Where, however, Mr. Meredith is the subject, the case is different. Mr. Meredith does not explain himself (at least to common ears), and he is worth explaining. He is, perhaps, the greatest creative force in modern literature: the father of its most vital product, the novel, he is probably the only real poet of our age, and had he possessed a greater command of form and articulation might also have gathered a new school of poetry. Perhaps he may yet do so. It seems plain at least that it is his attitude towards poetry and life that must be at the root of any new poetic movement. One may therefore make an exception and welcome Mrs. M. Sturge Henderson's "George Meredith: Novelist, "Poet and Reformer" (Methuen, Price 6s.) without reserve. The criticism of the novels is perhaps (for those already familiar with them) a little tedious in its minuteness. The chapter on Meredith as reviewer and critic will be of service to the most studious devotee, and there must be few who will not find the analysis of "Modern Love" useful. Meredith's obscurity springs not from any want of precision of thought, but rather from a too intense concentration on his ultimate end, the delineation of life as a whole. His eye is always focussed on the horizon, and closer details swim before him in vagueness and confusion of outline, only to be expressed by flying metaphors and fragmentary glances. Hence the extreme importance of a thorough understanding of his philosophical life. This philosophy is distilled into a pungent and bewildering essence in the poems, and it is here that the need of explanation is most felt. Mrs. Henderson has committed this branch to Mr. Basil de Selincourt, who deals with it in four admirable chapters. He differs from Mr. Trevelyan (rightly, I think,) in finding clear proof of a "systematic idealist foundation" underlying Meredith's work, but neither he nor Mrs. Henderson is blind to its weaknesses. In short, the book can be heartily recommended to all admirers of one of the most interesting and elusive personalities in modern literature.

* * *

Many people remember and re-read Mr. C. L. Graves' "Hawarden Horace," though this author has of late years been better known as a satirist in partnership. All who do so must regret that he gives us now so little of his own work, and welcome the issue by Messrs. Smith, Elder and Co., of a collection of his fugitive pieces under the title of "Humours of the Way." It is as a social satirist that Mr. Graves.

is perhaps most successful. For a modern he exhibits a refreshing candour, and he writes with neatness, spirit, and considerable metrical skill. Perhaps the first two pieces in the volume are as good as anything that he gives us in this line. They have the swiftness (if not the delicacy) of *Praed*, and they are instinct, moreover, with their author's own humour. Even *Praed* need not have disdained such a conceit as

" In those dark days man still was man,
The super still remained a super."

Indeed, wherever Mr. Graves has a good subject, his results are good. Admirably forcible and well expressed are his "*Mémoires du Siècle*" and the "*Partial Portrait*" of Richard Strauss, where the author is plainly writing on a subject upon which he feels deeply, and upon which many (ourselves among them) will sympathise with him. Mr. Meredith Townsend also inspires him to a charming "portrait" worthy of its theme. Occasionally, too, a pure *jeu d'esprit*, such as the "*Elegiac Stanzas*" and the lines "*On Some Cornish Names*" are delightfully carried out. In other instances (as in the sections called "*Holiday Rhymes*" and "*Fair Game*"), where the inspiration is less constant, the results are more unequal, the tricks of rhyme are sometimes obvious trickery and not every line seems a necessity. But then it takes a genius to write about nothing. Who but Calverley has ever done it to perfection?

* * *

"*Major Vigoureux*" (Messrs. Methuen and Co., Price 6s.), by Mr. A. T. Quiller-Couch, displays this subtle writer's characteristic qualities and genius at their highest. No doubt Mr. Quiller-Couch himself would regard the fantastic and repellent tragedy, "*Sir John Constantine*," as his greatest achievement. It is certainly his greatest effort, but, at any rate to the present writer, who has been a student of "*Q.'s*" art from the earliest days, the effort overreaches the goal. The real tragedy is lost in a mist of bizarre and intangible suggestions. In this comedy fine fantasy and exquisite description give us a true picture of the Scilly Isles and make a scene that fitly holds living men and women. The character of Major Vigoureux, the commandant forgotten by the War Office when they dismantled his guns and withdrew his garrison, is admirably drawn. We feel his ceaseless prick of conscience: should he notify the War Office and so lose his pay, so needful for the maintenance of a brother's widow and family living far off? The society of St. Lide's is sketched with an incisive hand. Miss Gabriel, the local bank manager and his wife, the naval officer, what country town does not own them? To such a society is vouchsafed a miracle. Years before, when Major Vigoureux first arrived to take over command, he had a Pisgah sight of an island girl just off to the mainland. The vision had never ceased to haunt him, and one night, when he has grown grey, poor and disheartened, she returns—a miracle out of the fog. She had become a famous singer. Chance determined that the liner bringing her home from America should be lost in an impenetrable fog. By her intimate knowledge of the islands and their currents she saves the vessel and anchors it safely off St. Lide's. With this prelude begins a romance not less impossible than the prelude itself. But impossibilities in romance are not legitimate subjects of criticism: *Credo quia impossibile*. One

does not criticise "The Tempest." He must be a very savage reader who cannot accept all "Q.'s" impossibilities and watch with open eyes the wayward witch, who has conquered two continents, mystifying and hypnotising the inhabitants of Lyonesse. We are almost persuaded to believe that Vashti Cara is alive to-day in the Isles of the West, and is the major's wife. The story is full of tender touches, full of wise insight into human hearts, of knowledge of men and women with the most different ideals. It is a fairy tale of real life.

* * *

Professor John Watson's series of lectures on "The Philosophical Basis of Religion" (James Maclehose and Sons, Price 8s. 6d. net) will appeal to many of our readers, though his total rejection of external authority in religion will hardly find favour with many acute reasoners in the realm of the philosophy of religion. The assumption that "the whole principle of authority was virtually overthrown at the beginning of the modern world with the Reformation and the Renaissance" shows that Dr. Watson is more of a philosopher than a historian, while it is perhaps a little rash to class the views either of Dr. Newman or Mr. Balfour as "obsolete." Newman was the pioneer of the conception of evolution in religion. The work, however, is both laborious and well informed, and gives at length the views of the great modern thinkers on the ultimate problems of religion. Dr. Watson finds himself in collision with most thinkers, and defends his own views with ability and vigour. His definition of religion as "at once a life, a creed, and a ritual" is very striking. The chapters dealing with Evil will be read with close interest. Dr. Watson deals fully with and rejects the conceptions of Evil that spring from the Mythical and the Pantheistic conceptions of God. Christianity "has never faltered in the belief that 'evil must be capable of being overcome.'" Evil "is never willed simply as evil; it appears at the time as the good of which a man is ever in search." The disillusionment that follows brings to light the higher self, and it becomes clear that "the source of evil lies in ignorance or the want of self-knowledge; but in so speaking we must be careful to observe that to be ignorant of oneself is ultimately to be ignorant of the principle of all goodness, i.e., of God." This is not the place in which a remarkable and highly controversial book covering a vast area of thought and history can be considered or criticised. Idealism is a great philosophic faith, but can it make religion a life in the average man? Is not authority of some sort needed? Does not the history of the philosophy of Christianity to which Dr. Watson devotes more than three hundred pages show this? To most Christians the historic Christ stands as the external authority whose word is Life.

* * *

Mr. William Scott Palmer is always an interesting and very thoughtful writer, and his recent book, "The Church and Modern Men" (Longmans, Green and Co., Price 3s. 6d. net), will be read with profit even if not with entire agreement. His introductory essays, "Towards the New Beginning," emphasising the religious birthright, if we may use such a term, of the thinker, strikes a fair and, to some extent, new note, while all will read with interest his treatment of "Modernism and the Teaching and Authority of the Church." It is

not a good policy to foster within the Church the "weaker brethren," and leave the strong man armed without the fold. "Do you not think, you who have no chance of seeing, that the return of the thinkers will do more to fortify and sustain the faith of the weaker brethren than all your care?" The leaders of the Church should lead. "How can you continue to be apostles and ministers unless you lead? We ask you to learn once more to lead, as St. Paul led, as St. Augustine led, as Athanasius led, even *contra mundum*. . . . We want hundreds of pastors and teachers to make clear to us, for instance, the very necessary distinction between the religious and theological statements that are 'of faith,' because they have roots in the depths of human experience, and stretch out branches and leaves and flowers to the expanding limits of its growth; and those other matters which are products of reflexion, statements of historical testimony, guesses of devout speculation, or interpretations by theological science aided by the philosophy of each particular age, and expressed now in terms of a vanished or vanishing manner of thought." Mr. Palmer represents very adequately a type of thinker who might be a leader of religion but is left discouraged by the wayside. Yet we fancy that he does not fully realise how much along the road he would follow is being done by bishops and ministers of all denominations. He perhaps forgets also that the social work, ever growing in magnitude, swallows up the time that might be given to the thinker. When the thinker and the babe are crying one turns to the babe. Mr. Palmer's difficulty as to the distinction between subjective and historical articles of faith is of course a fundamental difficulty, but surely also one must feel that history has the supreme functions, first of stating fundamental data, and secondly of confirming subjective articles of faith. It is also vital to remember that the law of evolution is valueless unless we realise that nothing can in the process of the suns be evolved that did not exist from the beginning in germ form. However, it is not possible here to do more than recommend this book to the consideration of church leaders.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Three volumes in "The Elzevir Library" (Messrs. Seeley and Co., Limited) have been recently issued: "The Fancy and Humour of Charles Lamb," "The Wit and Imagination of Benjamin Disraeli," and "Vignettes from Oliver Goldsmith." These charming little selections are well worth having. Fruitful thoughts in striking words may be read on every page. What a fine critic Lamb was, combining generosity, penetration, humour and judgment! "I have no repugnances. Shaftesbury is not too genteel for me, nor Jonathan Wild too low. I can read anything which I call a *book*. There are things in that shape which I cannot allow for such." Lamb foresaw the death that has since his time overtaken Byron's work: "I can never make out his great *power*, which his admirers talk of. Why a line of Wordsworth's is a lever to lift the immortal spirit! Byron's can only move the spleen." This last sentence was not true, but people now think what Lamb thought when Byron vied with Napoleon for the

consideration of Europe. What would Lamb have thought of Disraeli? Meanly, perhaps. But Disraeli is still alive in literature. He was, under all his paradoxes and his gibes, a mystic and a seer. His great Hebraic business powers could not hide the fact. The man who in his earliest days wrote, "There is no career except conquest," was fain to confess in later life: "The world was never conquered by intrigue; it was 'conquered by faith.'" The biographical introductions to these volumes by Mr. George Sampson (who is also responsible for the selections) will be found readable and useful.

* * *

"The Government's Record, 1906—7" (Metchims and Son, London), though issued for political use is a valuable pamphlet, as it shows in a handy form the actual work, both legislative and administrative, achieved by the present Government. The number of useful non-contentious Acts is quite remarkable, while many administrative reforms of an important character in matters of home and local government will be reckoned as righteousness to the Government by all parties. Improved facilities for the inspection of food, reports on the social conditions of workers, such as hop and fruit pickers, a report on the accounting system of local authorities, are instances of the work accomplished. Mr. Birrell has done good in Ireland in a very short period. Irish education, local government and land problems have all felt the influence of his clear mind and kind heart.

* * *

"Stokes' Cyclopædia of Familiar Quotations" (W. & R. Chambers, Limited, Edinburgh; F. A. Stokes Company, New York), compiled by Mr. Elford Eveleigh Treffry, is stated to contain "five thousand selections from six hundred authors, with a complete general index and 'an index of authors.'" Mr. Treffry in a careful Preface tells us that "to constitute familiarity a quotation must present, in 'pleasing and compact form, some noteworthy truth or idea—'be the latter philosophical or humorous. It must be incisive, to 'create an impression on the mind; it must be brief, to retain a 'hold, however slight, upon the memory.'" Mr. Treffry, keeping these excellent rules in mind, has ransacked English and American literature and some foreign literature for the purposes of this new collection. It must have been a very laborious task, and is, so far as we can see, well done. The quotations are in alphabetical order.

* * *

To-day the Church is being urged on all sides by Bampton lecturers and by anonymous laymen in revolt to buckle to the work presented by the "social problem." In a word, though his serene memory gets little credit for it, Frederick Denison Maurice is moving the conscience of the world to-day. Mr. J. Brierley, in "Our City of God" (James Clarke and Co., Price 6s.), is full of the neglect of the churches to deal with the social problem. He does not perhaps realise how much has been done, in the sixty years since the Broad Church was founded, towards solving the social problem. To-day the cry of the churches is Social Service. Mr. Brierley would have us seek as our ideal a new city of God, not restricted like Augustine's city, but universal. This city "will contain no slums," nor stand in glorious contrast to miles of black suburbs. He is not hopeless of achieving this end. "That

"reign of peace and brotherhood is as surely coming as is the rising "of to-morrow's sun." We are not hopeless either, but there is the need for the young thinkers to come over and help the churches. To-day the churches are in need of intellect. That is the fact of the matter—and it is the business of the leaders to press men into the service who can bring to social service willing *minds* as well as hearts. Mr. Brierley looks at the work of upbuilding from the theological, the social and the personal point of view, these three, and the greatest is the personal. The individual must save society; each mean street must find its evangelist.

* * *

Mr. E. Griffith-Jones is always hopeful in his sermons and papers on the vital elements of religious life, and many readers will turn to his somewhat recent volume, entitled, "Faith and Verification: with other "Studies in Christian Thought and Life" (James Clarke and Co., London, Price 5s.). Here we have a series of practical essays dealing with religion as an agency of practical life. Here we read of the efficacy of faith, of the education of the religious nature, of sin ["any "theory or teaching which in any way blurs the meaning of sin as an "awful and devastating mischief, for which there can be no excuse, "seems to me to cut at the very root and nerve centre of spiritual "life"], of the "preventive power" of Christianity, of imagination in religion, of grace. Dignity and lucidity of style are in these papers combined with the helpfulness that belongs to all this writer's work.

* * *

It would not be easy to find a volume more useful as a general introduction to ancient history than the abridgment in English of Doctor Charles Seignobos' "Histoire de la Civilisation," now published under the title, "History of Ancient Civilisation" (T. Fisher Unwin, Price 5s. net). It is simply and attractively written, it is accurate, it gives a full idea of the unity of all history, and a great deal of information on subjects with which the general reader is unfamiliar. The first chapter on prehistoric ages, dealing with the early and late stone ages—the cave-men and lake-men—the bronze and iron ages is valuable. Man was man, at least as far back as the Quarternary geologic period. He moved upward slowly at first, but in geometrical progression. From the axe of flint to the sword of iron, from the necklace of teeth to the refined gold crown, it took man thousands of years to move. But movement grew faster, and to-day a few years may revolutionise the form of civilisation. But even to-day we have all stages of civilisation existing side by side, and here we read how the highest forms steadily evolved. We read of Aryans and Semites, of Egypt and Babylon, of Persians and Phœnicians, of Hebrews and Greeks, of Etruscans and Romans, of the growth of religion, of art, of society, of law. The boys and girls and children of larger growth who read this book will obtain a sound basis for thought and study. It is not only a book for the reader who reads for culture, but also an introduction to the higher regions of historical research.

* * *

Mr. Edward Hutton's lengthy and pleasantly-illustrated volume—by Mr. William Parkinson—dealing with "Florence and the Cities of "Northern Tuscany, with Genoa" (Messrs. Methuen and Co., Price

6s.) will, we are sure, be carried to Italy by everyone who is about to sojourn in Florence and Tuscany. It is well-informed, enthusiastic and packed with information. All that the traveller needs to know, and more than most students, in fact, know, of Italy, her history and her art, is to be found within these covers—art, history, poetry, scenery are all brought before the reader in admirable fashion. All lovers of Northern Italy should possess this book.

* * *

"British Country Life in Spring and Summer: the Book of the "Open Air" (Hodder and Stoughton, Price 8s. 6d. net) is a portly tome consisting of useful and attractive though unequal letterpress dealing with every imaginable country subject, introduced by "open-air "diaries" for the months from April to September, and illustrated by twenty-seven most admirable whole-page illustrations in colours—the picture itself being loosely mounted on grey paper. These pictures are the feature of the book. Some are from photographs and some from original paintings by Mr. W. Tatton Winter, R.B.A. ("May Blossoms," "Lavender," "Harvest"), and Mr. Frank Southgate, R.B.A. ("The Green Woodpecker," "The Moorhen," "Jays," "The Widgeon"). The excellent photographs include striking pictures of the otter, the badger, the grebe, the adder, the willow-wren, the rabbit, the peacock butterfly, the silver-washed fritillary. It is altogether a book to possess, and will make a glorious and helpful holiday present for boy or girl.

* * *

Mrs. Aubrey Richardson's volume, entitled, "The Lover of Queen Elizabeth: being the Life and Character of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 1533—1588" (T. Werner Laurie, London, Price 12s. 6d. net), is very well written, admirably illustrated, and throws some new light on the complex characters and strange relations of Queen Elizabeth and Robert Dudley. She does not clear up the mystery of Amy Robsart—that is insoluble—but on the whole one is able to feel that both the Queen and her favourite were innocent of any crime. Indeed, one is inclined to think with Mrs. Richardson, that the relationship of the two was in reality and truth that of brother and sister. The Queen does not mind shocking Europe and the English Church. *Honi soit qui mal y pense* so long as she kept her friend and private counsellor. That under some circumstances she would have married him is possible, but the interests of England seemed to her incompatible with any marriage. Yet certainly her relationship with Leicester was dangerous, for despite his many good and even great qualities he was probably "a disciple of Macchiavelli."

* * *

We can but note the publication, in the "French Men of Letters" series, edited by Dr. Alexander Jessup, of the monograph on François Rabelais (J. B. Lippincott Co., Price 6s. net) by Mr. Arthur Tilley. The book was wanted, since to most English readers this great writer is little known, and his place in literature is inadequately appreciated even by well-educated men and women. Mr. Tilley points out that "the publication of Des Marets's and Rathery's edition of "Rabelais's work, in 1857, marked a new epoch in the study "of Rabelais. To this edition was prefixed a 'Life' by Rathery,

"in which, for the first time, all the legendary matter was carefully pruned away, and no fact was admitted that was not based upon trustworthy evidence. . . . At the close of 1902 a fresh impetus was given to Rabelaisian studies by the foundation of the "Société des Etudes Rabelaisiennes." The organ of this society, the *Revue des Etudes rabelaisiennes*, is doing good work in extending our knowledge of the life and works of the author of Pantagruel and Gargantua. "Rabelais was a humanist, in an age when the best humanists were encyclopædists. . . . He was neither a trained philologist, nor a trained jurist, nor a trained archaeologist. But he was an omnivorous reader of Greek and Latin literature. The two Greek authors to whom he owed most were Lucian and Plutarch." He was largely influenced by Sir Thomas More, and had an intimate knowledge of the vernacular literature of France and Italy. He was thus well equipped, and drew upon the past with the frankness of the sixteenth century. Gargantua was not his invention, though he was his creator as far as the world is concerned. The interesting volume gives us all the latest discussions of Rabelaisian facts and fancies, and is of real critical value.

* * *

We welcome Mrs. Huxley's little volume of "Aphorisms and Reflections" (Macmillan and Co., Price 2s. 6d. net), drawn from her famous husband's writings. The world of thought, both in matters of science and matters of philosophy, has changed vastly since Huxley's death, and one may doubt if to-day he would have dogmatised as brilliantly as was his wont twenty years ago. But his reflections are often full of thoughts that will not stale with time. The future is not likely to alter his conclusion that "M. Comte's philosophy, in practice, might be compendiously described as Catholicism *minus* Christianity." Here we have passages chosen, some "for their philosophy, some for their moral guidances, some for their scientific exposition of natural facts, or for their insight into social questions, others for their charms of imagination or genial humour, and many—not the least—for their pure beauty of lucid English writing." Our only criticism is that conclusions no longer acceptable to thinkers, especially on matters of religion, are included in the selection. This is unwise. The definition of science as "nothing but *trained and organised common sense*" is full of interest just now. An admirable portrait is to be found at the beginning of the volume.

* * *

We must note, but cannot do more, Dr. Frank Ballard's divinity thesis entitled "The True God: a Modern Summary of the Relations of Theism to Naturalism, Monism, Pluralism, and Pantheism" (Robert Culley, London). Mr. Ballard dwells on "The Warrant of Theism." We agree that the mystery of pain, or the greater mystery of evil, is not fatal to the conception of a Divine purpose. In dealing with "Theistic Monism as compared with Pantheism," he insists that the intelligibility of Nature must be the product of intelligence. He asserts the same of Nature's directivity and unity. This is all possibly true, but on the whole it may be doubted if such evidence imports more than a high degree of probability. The discussion is interesting and of value at the present time.

* * *

Mr. Walter Crane's volume, entitled, "India. Impressions: with 'some Notes of Ceylon during a Winter Tour, 1906-7'" (Methuen and Co., Price 7s. 6d. net), will be read with great pleasure by all admirers, and their name is legion, of that delightful draughtsman. Mr. Crane's frontispiece in colour of "The Mauikarniká Ghat, Benares," is perfectly charming, while the other very numerous illustrations and plates will attract and delight every reader. Take an instance at random: on page 182 we have a charming line sketch, very slight and full of suggestion, in which we see the merchants of Kashmir displaying their goods to Mr. and Mrs. Crane; on the opposite page we have a plate of the Mosque of Waza Khan at Lahore—a perfect example of elaborate draughtsmanship, giving a verisimilitude that no photograph could produce. These "few notes and fresh impressions" will give Englishmen and Englishwomen that closer familiarity with India which Mr. Crane feels is wanting in the English people. Mr. Crane has more sympathy with native national aspirations than we at present feel, but all will admit that none of us know enough about our greatest possession.

* * *

"Where the Wind Sits" (Hodder and Stoughton, Price 6s.) is another volume by the author of "Honorias Patchwork." Honorias is a cultured, thoughtful young woman who keeps a journal and discourses on many subjects. Her touch is light, and whether she is discussing Calvin and Luther with "the historian," or arguing with Mme. de Bregé on the comparative virtues of the English and French nations, her remarks are full of interest. She is a keen lover and observer of Nature. By the time the end of the book is reached we seem to know Honorias well. It is a book that can be taken up and enjoyed at any time.

* * *

In "The White Darkness," by Lawrence Mott (W. Heinemann, Price 6s.), we have a welcome change from the ordinary novel. Mr. Mott evidently has a wide knowledge of the French-Canadian trappers and the Mounted Police. The stories depict the great hardships of their lives, yet through all there runs a vein of brightness and *bonne camaraderie* and of kindness to each other when in trouble. Some of the stories are full of pathos, as in that of "Jaquette" and "Light of 'a Match." The story of Black Dan in "The Current of Fear" relates how a bully was punished, but there is more light than shadow in the tales.

* * *

Dr. Milton S. Terry's "Biblical Dogmatics: an Exposition of the 'Principal Doctrines of the Holy Scriptures'" (Robert Culley, London, Price 10s. 6d. net), is a work of vast length (600 pages), and it completes "the trilogy of our contributions to the study of biblical interpretation and doctrine which we began with the issue of Biblical Hermeneutics in 1883. The Biblical Apocalypics followed in 1898." The term "Dogmatics" means "a systematic exposition of religious truth." The author (who is the Professor of Christian Doctrine in the Garrett Biblical Institute) claims nothing new or strange for his work. He questions, he tells us, no fundamental truth: "The only issue is one of interpretation, and on most questions of interpretation

"there is room for differences of opinion." We can only draw the attention of students to this vast tome, which is divided into an Introduction dealing with the idea, scope, sources and method of Biblical Dogmatics, followed by treatises on "The Constitution and Possibilities of Man," "The Manifestation of Christ," and "Our Father in Heaven." This last part deals elaborately with progressive Revelation, "The Universal Revelation, the Hebrew Revelation, the Revelation in Jesus Christ."

* * *

The late Dr. John Watson, in his volume, "God's Message to the Human Soul: the Use of the Bible in the Light of the New Knowledge" (Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, Price 5s.), deals with the use of the Bible in the pulpit. He dwells successively with the construction, the standpoint, the humanity, the authority, the style, the use of the Bible. The preachers of all and every denomination will have much to learn from this interesting volume. "This *réchauffé* of stale news" or this second-rate review of current literature is not what people "are expecting from the pulpit or what they come to hear," he tells us drily in one place. It is true enough. "The supreme end of preaching" is one which lifts a man above antiquarian investigations and historical disquisitions, for he is set with every power that is in him, with all his knowledge, his passions, his pity, his humanity, to reconcile man "to God."

* * *

"The Wings of the Morning: Addresses from a Glasgow Pulpit" (Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, Price 5s.), is the title of a volume of sermons preached by the Rev. G. H. Morrison. It is scarcely possible in a review of this nature to notice at length the many volumes of sermons now issued from the press, but we gladly make an exception here, for these sermons appear to have a note of their own, and appeal to a larger congregation than even that commanded by Mr. Morrison in Glasgow. The address entitled "The Best Wine Last" strikes a sound note. It is the quality of sin to have the best wine at the first: "Do you not think, now, if all the miseries of drunkenness were to meet a man upon the verge of drinking—do you not think he would cry out for help, and turn from his accursed vice and flee?" The sermon on "The Perils of the Middle-Aged" is of worth. Disillusionment and loss of faith come "as youth expires and middle age begins." Then comes "the destruction that wasteth at noon-day." Loss of faith is the true illusion: "Christ never for an hour lost faith in man."

* * *

The many admirers of the late Dr. John Laidlaw, some time Professor of Systematic Theology at New College, Edinburgh, and one of the most brilliant preachers and scholars of the Free Churches of Scotland, will be glad to possess Dr. H. R. Mackintosh's very appreciative memoir of, and the sermons by, Dr. Laidlaw, now published under the title of "Studies in the Parables, and other Sermons" (Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, Price 6s.). Dr. Laidlaw was born at Edinburgh on April 7th, 1832; he died on September 21st, 1906. He was always weakly in health, and his long, laborious life was one more instance of what determination can achieve. His influence was great both in and out of the pulpit, and

it is well that his message of godliness and eloquence should receive in some measure a permanent form.

* * *

Mr. W. G. Hole has already gained the attention of lovers of poetry with his "Procris" and "Queen Elizabeth," and his little volume of "New Poems" (George Bell and Sons, Price 1s.) will be read with interest. It contains fourteen short lyric pieces and a longer dramatic lyric called "The Reckoning." The shorter pieces are the most successful. Mr. Hole has the poet's eye and fancy, he writes with sincere and often deep feeling, and, if he does not give one an impression of profundity, he never speaks unless he has something to say. "The Herald of Autumn" is perhaps a good specimen of the poet at his best, "The Haunted Fields," too, is full of feeling and beautifully expressed, while "The Dartmoor Hut Circle" has some lovely stanzas, as the following:—

And brooding gorse in some lone combe
May spill like golden tears its bloom
Upon the granite of thy tomb

Where Mr. Hole flies higher, as in "The Reckoning" and "Keats' Grave" the results are more commonplace, though never quite without distinction.

* * *

Mr. Fred. G. Bowles (himself well known as a writer of lyric verse) has, in a volume entitled "New Songs" (Chapman and Hall, Price 3s. 6d. net), made an anthology of the unpublished or uncollected poems of new and for the most part unknown authors. The idea was a happy one, and will be valuable if it brings to some of the writers whose verses are included some measure of public recognition. The selected poems maintain a fairly high level, with occasional lapses into dullness, and are of considerable variety. The book starts well with two striking stanzas by Major W. A. Adam, entitled, "Fate." Later, one may notice Christine Bickle's lines, "To the First Violet," and some spirited Scottish ballads, full of genuine feeling, by R. S. Craig. Two poems by Lady Margaret Sackville (whose talents are already well known) are perhaps the best thing in the volume, while Ada Elizabeth Smith's, "The Earth Lover," that immediately follows them, has the ring of a real tragedy. In another style is Lance Fallaw's "Cape to Cairo," which has the vigour and imagination of Kipling's best work. Altogether the collection is one of considerable interest, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Bowles will repeat the experiment.

NOTES.

We deeply regret to record the death, on December 17th last, of Lord Kelvin of Largs, the most eminent scientist in Europe. William Thompson was born in Belfast on June 24th, 1824. He was educated at Glasgow, and passed to Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he became (he was a pupil of Percival Frost) 2nd wrangler—the senior was Parkinson—and First Smith's

Prizeman. He was very soon elected to the Chair of Natural Philosophy at Glasgow, his father at that date being the Professor of Mathematics. From this time onward his career was one constant course of intellectual triumph. Whether as an investigator into the theories of physical science, or an inventor, rapidly transforming scientific possibilities into practical facts, he stood almost alone. In pure thought he was not the equal of Cayley or Clerk Maxwell, but it was Thompson who turned the theories of the latter genius to practical effect. To Lord Kelvin we owe ocean telegraphy and a wonderful compass that is used throughout the world. His inventions are too numerous to name, while scientific papers have poured from his pen for sixty years. The *Times* in its admirable notice of this great and lovable man says truly that he took "all physical science to be his province." The decision that Lord Kelvin is to be buried in Westminster Abbey will meet with universal approval.

* * *

In spite of their multifarious activities, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb have been making good progress with their remarkable description of the local government of England and Wales as it existed between 1689 and 1835. The next volume, which the publishers hope to have ready this month, will deal with the manor and the borough. The early history of that subject owes much to Professor Maitland and Miss Bateson. They both edited volumes for the Selden Society, whose work is perhaps the best known among the learned societies. It exists "to encourage the study and advance the knowledge of the history of the English law," but receives so little general support that without substantial subsidies from the Inns of Court its career would come to a close. In "Township and Borough" Professor Maitland made an independent contribution to the subject, which has also been illumined by Professor Vinogradoff in "The Growth of the Manor." Mention should also be made of Mr. Hone's admirable volume in "The Antiquary's Books." Thus Mr. Webb's volume will form a valuable supplement to these researches in the earlier history of the manor and borough.

* * *

One of the most charming libraries in the kingdom is "St. Deniol's Library," Hawarden, founded by Mr. Gladstone. There is not only the beauty of pleasant surroundings outside, the quiet of the "Temple of Peace" within, but also the intimate association with a great mind through the annotations upon many of the books. The habit began in early years as is shown by specimens of Eton school-books. But the family has desired that these notes should not be given to the public, and with an occasional exception the wish has been respected. It is reasonable. There is something not quite wholesome in the manner in which we desire to expose to public gaze the private meditations of famous people. So it is to be regretted that the presentation to the London Library of 600 volumes which belonged to the late Sir Leslie Stephen should have been followed by a communication to the *Times* of some of the annotations from his hand. Some reflect no credit on the writer, and would probably never have been made if the possibility of their use in this way had presented itself. Nevertheless, his family have made a handsome gift which students will highly appreciate and which forms a notable addition to a great library.

* * *

It is remarkable that in spite of the extensive relations between England and foreign countries there is no collection of translations of the codes of foreign countries. Something has been done in recent years by private initiative, but it seems rather anomalous that it should have been left to a Chinese scholar to present a translation of the German Civil Code to the English public. Dr. Wang, who has studied at Yale and in Berlin, and is a member of the Middle Temple, has accomplished an extremely able piece of work. But it has been suggested that there should be in English a uniform series corresponding to the *Collection de Codes étrangers*. Whether the translations should be made under the auspices of the Society of Comparative Legislation or by the authority of a committee attached to the Foreign Office is a matter for discussion. It seems to be a sound and reasonable suggestion that there should be a complete set of English translations of at least the commercial codes of foreign countries.

* * *

The United States Congress appears to be even more busily employed than the London County Council in erecting memorials commemorative of notable men and deeds. In the last session one hundred thousand dollars were appropriated for a memorial to Christopher Columbus to be erected in the City of Washington. Ten thousand dollars were granted for "the completion of a monument to commemorate the taking possession of the Pacific Coast by the late Commodore "John D. Sloat," on the military reservation at Monterey, California. By another Act of Congress twelve thousand five hundred dollars were allotted to procure and erect upon Tippecanoe battleground a monument in honour of General W. H. Harrison and the soldiers who composed the American army in that battle on November 7th, 1811. Double that sum is appropriated for the completion of a monument to the memory of the soldiers who fell in the battle of New Orleans, in the war of 1812. Among other memorials to which Congress has recently made grants of money are a bronze statue of Longfellow in Washington, and a commemoration of the landing of the Pilgrims and the signing of the "Mayflower" compact.

* * *

Mr. William Stigand sends us a protest against the notice of his recently published poems which appeared in the last number of this REVIEW. We are sorry to have ruffled the feelings of a literary veteran; but Mr. Stigand will probably admit, on reflection, that the notice of which he complains is by no means censorious, but includes a good measure of praise, and that as to poetic qualities he cannot expect this generation to take the view of the preceding one. [Ed.]

[Correspondence and communications relating to the Literary Supplement should be addressed to the Editor, who cannot in any case undertake to return manuscripts.]

* * *

NOTICE.—All communications respecting advertisements must be addressed to T. B. BROWNE, Ltd., 163, Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.; Advertisements should be sent in by the 20th of each month.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. MR. SCOTT LIDGETT ON "THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION": A REVIEW	
By Dr. A. M. FAIRBAIRN 	1
2. REVIEWS 	6
LAY SERMONS AND ADDRESSES. ELLICE HOPKINS. TIDES.	
ANNOTATED EDITION OF TENNYSON. ENGLISH MUSIC.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS: William Allingham: A Diary, etc. 	17
4. NOTES 	21

MR. SCOTT LIDGETT ON "THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION": A REVIEW.

IN the preface which introduces this book, Mr. Scott Lidgett refers to what he feels to be "the ceaseless pressure of public engagements." This means that his days have been passed in the duty of putting into the conduct and characters of our men and into the institutions of our land, the ideals which are native to the Christian religion; and the book itself is evidence that his nights have been passed in thought touching the religion of Christ, which he here attempts "to explain and to verify." Between these two classes of work there is no inconsistency or disharmony: on the contrary, there is the most perfect agreement. One cannot face men, especially as grouped into the social system we all know so well, without feeling how much in their relations to each other is wrong; nor can one look into the outward face of the Christian religion without seeing how much every son of light has still to put into the souls of men. In other words, the man who does not think, does not know; what he sees quickens his thought, and his quickened thought opens his eyes to see things hidden from the sense-bound, or the man who, seeing, yet sees not the daily appeal to the eye, and hearing, yet hears not the sounds that every day smite the ear. Thus thoughtful men alone feel the contradiction between the Christian religion and the lower and coarser types and forms of humanity. And he who knows, by his own experience, this contradiction, yet is not afraid to look upon these types and forms with an open eye; he alone can feel in fullest measure the sacred fire of ambition burn within him to set these deformities of men straight. From this point of view we can fairly say that there

is nothing more needful than to know human nature on the one hand, and the purpose of God and the meaning of Jesus Christ on the other.

This book is an exposition of the Christian faith, though in the form of an apology for it, and is as it were an apologetical exposition. The term apology, indeed, has almost become a technical name for a chapter in "Christian evidences." In Greek it simply signifies "a speech in defence," or, like its cognate, a story told for its moral; yet it was one of the words that in the age of Elizabeth and her father became naturalized, being borrowed, indirectly, from Greece, though directly from France. Sir Thomas More, indeed, uses the term "apology" in the title-page of a book to express the idea that, because of objections to do the work required of him, he demitted or gave over the office of Lord Chancellor; and the term was used to signify that his act was neither willing nor spontaneous, but stood in need of justification. Shakespeare also used the term freely; while Milton makes Eve come to Adam bearing

. . . in her hand
A bough of fairest fruit.
New gathered
. but in her face excuse
Came Prologue and Apology to prompt.

In the eighteenth century Watson's "Apology for the Bible" made the term more common, but it never lost the sense that the best defence consists in making the contents of an idea or a book better understood.

Apologetics, therefore, do not refer merely to the defence of literary documents such as are gathered into the Bible, but to an exposition which regards religion as a whole. This Mr. Scott Lidgett keeps clearly in view; yet no man can forget that in Bishop Butler's day unbelief was much more fashionable than now. So much so, that in the Advertisement to the "Analogy"—a book here quoted to most excellent purpose—he said what no one could say now, that "Christianity was not so much as a subject of inquiry," but had at length been "discovered to be fictitious." Toland had proved that "Christianity was not mysterious"; and Matthew Tindal had argued in a book which, without being named or referred to, yet underlies the "Analogy," that "the Gospel was the republication of the religion of Nature," though what "the religion of Nature" means, and what its relation to the faith of the primitive savage, or the centuries of Christian history, no attempt was made to define and explain. "The Sect of Free Thinkers" was then esteemed as the church of the wits,

about whose wisdom Anthony Collins discoursed; but Bentley, then Master of Trinity, and with an eye on the Divinity Professorship at Cambridge, said in his famous "Remarks," published in 1713, under the pseudonym of "Phileleutheros Lipsiensis," "that Free Thought was more remarkable for its freedom than its thought," for it consisted largely in thinking and judging by chance, a feat "which every inhabitant of Bedlam practises every day, as much as any of our illustrious sect." Collins would have justified the preacher who, at a conference on religion, took as the theme of his sermon "The being of God," and defended his choice on the ground that it was the one point all were agreed on. The story is told of him that a party of friends, invited to stay with him in his Essex home, were astonished to find that he sent to Church on Sunday all his servants. The friends expressed the surprise they felt, but got an answer characteristic of the man and the time: "I do it that they may neither murder nor rob me." The story is so far good that it expresses in brief the idea not only that the opponents of the Christian religion appreciate its ethical restraints, but also their value as deterrents from both serious and frivolous crime.

This book, then, which holds fast to this sense of the word apology, also holds fast the position that no defence is complete without an exposition of the faith, and faith is richer and broader than the mind of man. It has within it elements which go beyond the narrow limits of his culture. I do not feel, therefore, as if the Christian apologist was fighting a losing battle. He is not; and he need not be despondent, or meet unrest without by equal unrest within his own breast. He can calmly argue, certain that his cause will triumph.

Mr. Scott Lidgett says that "The main facts to be borne in mind are these: In the first place, that the progress of Christianity has been primarily due to the spiritual experience, and not to the formal doctrine of the Church. Secondly, that the growth of that experience, and its manifold contact with the world and life as a whole, has entailed intellectual consequences and given rise to many succeeding attempts at formal explanation. And, lastly, that the success of such attempts must be measured by their power to satisfy the Christian consciousness itself, and to give an account of its relationship to the universe and its history which meets all the claims, whether spiritual, moral, or rational, which can rightfully be made upon it." It will be noted that while he thus carefully distinguishes between "spiritual experiences" and "formal doctrine" he does not indicate what he means by either; yet both phrases are ambiguous and need distinction based on discussion. There can be no clarity of thought without clear and intelligible

language. This is the more incumbent upon a writer if he would frame an apologetic for religion, especially if his note is dissatisfaction with all previous attempts. "Experience," has, indeed, a multitude of meanings in both religion and philosophy; even William James, though he devoted a whole volume to the "varieties of religious experience," evidently thinks the term has no need of elucidation, and has no history. Our author may be said to agree with Professor James, while I, on the other hand, hold the contrary. As with "experience" so with "doctrine," which, specially as used in old English and in the New Testament, translates the Latin and simply means teaching, as "doctor" does not signify a mere learned man, but a teacher—a man empowered and qualified to teach. "Doctrine" thus stands at the opposite extreme from dogma, which expresses the substantive idea of being fixed by decree, and may be the voice of a school, a sect, or a council, but is never the voice either of a church or of a man. How, then, can experience be enlightened without teaching, however formal? Experience may stand as the antithesis to dogma, but not to doctrine, for teaching is a main factor to be reckoned with in all experience.

Mr. Scott Lidgett also notes the necessities which affect the demand for a re-statement of the nature and grounds of Christian belief, and says that "the universe as it exists involves the union of continuity and distinction, of sameness and difference." I am glad to find that so early in the book the author recognises what may be termed the fundamental question in modern thought. "Scientific" mainly emphasises the notion of continuity, and philosophy mainly the idea of difference and distinction. To find them in their union recognised as lying at the root of every attempt to interpret the universe is indeed pleasant and grateful; but Mr. Scott Lidgett will be the first to confess that it is easier to recognise a problem than to find its solution. "Continuity," as regards Christian thought, exists mainly in the field of History; "difference" in the field of Nature. Let me, then, put this matter to our author: "Are you prepared to affirm the historical continuity of Christianity not simply with Judaism but with Hellenism; and are you ready to affirm that in history the religion we profess is continuous not only with Hebraism but with Hellenism, and with much that comes still later?" As to Nature, what kind of God does it reveal? Is He an object, a thing that has being apart from man; or is He a subject, a thing that has being in man; or is He a species of indifference (here used in its philosophical, and not in its popular sense, to denote an absence of difference or presence of identity), a *tertium quid* that unites Nature and man? Is the Cause of Nature at once manlike, and not manlike, God and

not God, permanent yet ephemeral, subjective yet objective, a form of the divine idea which, as an idea, is yet independent of form ? Then "continuity" has, as it were, a subjective form in the question which lies at the root of all Kant's criticism ; how man comes by his knowledge ; and an objective form in the Hegelian dialectic. The principle of difference has a subjective form in such systems as Hume's, as John Stuart Mill's, as Herbert Spencer's ; an objective form in systems as unlike these as those of Fichte, of Hamann and of Baader. The so-called Agnosticism is a subjective system, which says, in effect, that man cannot know the universe or its cause ; and in denying that man can know God, denies also that God can make Himself known. Hegel said : " God thunders with His thunder and is yet not known " ; but he adds : " If God is to be known as spirit, He must do more than thunder " ; i.e., the man who knows God as spirit knows himself beforehand as spirit too. The two ideas "continuity" and "difference" emerge also in the notion that every Christian apologist who holds fast by "continuity" must believe in the immanence of God, i.e., that He dwells both in man as mind and in the universe as Nature. The life of both is thought, which is implicit in Nature and explicit in man. "Difference" and "distinction" mean the Transcendence of God ; He is before Nature, and He must be after it. These things are contained in Mr. Scott Lidgett's opening sentences, though they are not fully worked out in the thought that explicates, or the logic that deduces and builds up his cumulative argument.

I find myself much more in agreement with Mr. Scott Lidgett's philosophical and theological positions than with his historical. It is a misfortune that a man should commit himself to a variety of uncritical positions, especially if these are entirely gratuitous. For example, I do not agree that Greek religion consists more in the exercise of naive and inconsistent imagination than Hebraism, especially if the great thinkers of antiquity be, as here, included ; nor do I think ethics are the essence of religion, especially as the Greek and the Roman apprehended it. Nor can I quite sympathise with our author as respects his presentation of the Christianity of the apologists ; nor would I admit that he is right in thinking that Alexandria had an intellectual atmosphere which stimulated reflection upon the inner meaning of the religion. Neither would I think that Clement of Alexandria had a more profound and spiritual temper than Origen ; or that the *De Civitate Dei* of Augustine carried out the principles and practices of the earlier apologists. So far as Augustine is concerned I am prepared to prove that his inspiration was more heathen than Christian ; that it proceeded more from Neo-Platonism and Plotinus

than from any Christian faith or any other single source. Nor do I find our author more convincing and informed as the account proceeds. I would not allow, for example, his account of the Protestant Churches that arose at the Reformation to be correct; nor would I set the Racovian Catechism and the Socinian position generally in relation to all Churches, rather would I have it stand alongside the Remonstrant as a heresy peculiar to the Reformed Churches. Coming down still later, and passing over the account of Bacon we come to John Locke; and here let me simply say that Locke never understood the Cartesian notion of innate ideas, and so he never refuted it. So far as I know there are in the "Essay Concerning the Human Understanding," only two express references to Descartes, one in the third and another in the fourth book. The introduction, which deals with the notion of innate ideas, was written in view of Lord Herbert of Cherbury's version of Descartes' theory, where the idea, as innate, expressed a distinct something—a thought or idea which man had, rather than the constitution of the mind, which was Descartes' meaning when he used his famous phrase. Then, finally, I am still more doubtful as to whether adequate justice has been done to Hume or to Kant; certainly I do not believe that the Scottish philosophy is here fairly and fully discussed or its answer to Hume clearly stated and conceived.

I have taken the liberty not only of differing from Mr. Scott Lidgett, but of frankly expressing my difference; yet I feel that nothing can do justice to his book. I believe with Hegel that God does not wish an empty-headed man to be His child, but any person, however empty-headed, can play the critic, while it takes a man of another order to play the part of the "laudator." This part I fain would play, and so cordially congratulate Mr. Scott Lidgett on the work he has done.]

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

LAY SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

Dr Caird has bequeathed a precious legacy to the famous college of which he was master, and, through that college, to the world, by the publication of the lay sermons and addresses which he delivered in the Hall of Balliol "at the beginning of each academical year, following thus, as far as a layman could, the example" of

* "Lay Sermons and Addresses: Delivered in the Hall of Balliol College, Oxford." By Edward Caird, LL.D., D.C.L., late Master. (James Maclehose. Price 6s.)

his predecessors. Here we have twelve sermons reflecting the highest ideals that modern action, thought and religion have brought before the modern mind. Here are faced with admirable courage and profound knowledge of human nature, and especially of that nature in youth time, those problems of morals and of life that have plunged some great minds in despair and have braced others to superhuman efforts. Dr. Caird is, above all things, a philosopher, and to him philosophy is a living thing that must justify itself in action. Applied philosophy is even more necessary in life than applied mathematics, for it should play the same part in the inner life that science plays in the outer life. But the inner life is the true reality, the world where the soul is either bound with the fetters, or emancipated from the bonds, of the world. It is of this life that Dr. Caird, in the main, treats. The sermon with which the volume opens, entitled, "The Two Aspects of College Life," deals with what the preacher calls the "fundamental problem of social life" in its relation to the common life of a college. This problem is, in effect, "to find some method of uniting what is good in Socialism, with what is good in Individualism." The text of the address is that passage in Galatians (vi. 2-4) which, in effect, directs that union and points out the method: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ. . . . But let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another; for every man shall bear his own burden." Dr. Caird points out that these contrasted passages do not represent two ends, "but one end viewed in two different aspects."

A society that does not liberate and enrich the individual life, and an individual life which does not go out of itself in love and service to the society of which it is a part, are both of them necessarily smitten with barrenness. . . . if by attaining our own good we mean realising the highest of which ~~we~~ are capable, and by helping others we mean assisting them to attain the highest of which ~~they~~ are capable, it is demonstrable that neither desire can be fully realised until it becomes coincident with the other. In truth, we are bound so closely together that we cannot rise or fall alone.

This lesson is to be learnt at college, and may be learnt there better, perhaps, than anywhere else.

Among your predecessors there have been many—I can remember not a few myself—who began in this College to show that love of truth and freedom, that interest in the national welfare, that sympathy with the needs and cares of others, which afterwards enabled them to widen the bounds of knowledge, to raise the moral tone of professional life, to maintain the honour and justice of England in dealing with weaker and less civilised races, or to bring help and healing to the hardships and sufferings

of the poor in our own country. And if it is the few who do great and marked service in any of these directions, we have to remember that it is the spirit of the many that makes their efforts possible.

The sermon on Freedom and Truth, based on the text "~~Ye~~ shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," is an admirable exposition of the necessary relationship of those great forces in the history of the world. Dr. Caird puts this relationship vividly before us :—

We cannot free men except by enlightening them, and we cannot enlighten them without setting them free. Ignorance of ourselves ; ignorance of the nature God has given us, and of the fellow men among whom He has placed us ; ignorance of the conditions of their life in this world, and of the good in which alone their human souls can find satisfaction, these are the chains that keep men in perpetual slavery. And if we could once *know* them, in the sense of clearly apprehending and thoroughly realising the truth about them, our chains would be broken. . . . To be persistently truthful with ourselves, to keep ourselves persistently open to all the teachings of experience, to listen to the enlightening word that comes from others with as much willingness to profit as if it were a thought that arose in our own minds, is the only way in which we can gradually learn to meet all the occasions of life with that instant, intuitive sense of the right act to do and the right word to speak, which we sometimes experience in our best moments.

But does Truth so attained make us free ? It does not "if it be freedom to live without rule." It demands "that we should endeavour to view our own life and our relations to others in the light in which we are revealed to ourselves in our clearest and best moments—in those moments when the pressure of immediate passion is lifted from our souls, and all the disguises under which we hide from ourselves have fallen away." Dr. Caird convinces one that the great problem of life "is to retain permanently the consciousness of the better self in subjection to which alone we can be truly free, because only in realising it can we be at one with ourselves. In every other life we must be slaves because in every other life we must be hypocrites, divided against ourselves, using double weights and measures, and hiding from ourselves the meaning of our own acts." In the ideal life the service of truth will have given us perfect freedom.

From sermon after sermon we are tempted to quote at length. So complete a philosophy of personal and social life has rarely, if ever, been penned with such striking simplicity and completeness. The essay on "Salvation here and hereafter" is the fitting crown of

all Maurice's teaching. The noblest and most religious men and women to-day are not content

- without seeing their reward in the improvement of the earthly life of those around them, in purer and more noble relations of men and women in the household, in the higher honesty and justice of our politics and our commerce, in the growing refinement of the manners and the elevation of the morality of our people, and in the opening up of intellectual enlightenment and aesthetic enjoyment to all those who are capable of them; in short, in the realisation of the Kingdom of God among men in this present world.

That is the noblest note of to-day: "Salvation here as well as hereafter." True Christianity, we are told with emphasis, "is not something that was once published in Palestine, and which has been handed down by a dead tradition ever since; it is a living and growing spirit that learns the lessons of history, and is ever manifesting new powers and leading us to new truths." But Dr. Caird does not leave us unhelped as to the life beyond the grave. To him, apart from revelation, the strong evidence for man's future existence is "that we cannot give a rational account of the facts, cannot conceive them as part of an intelligible order, if it be not true." We cannot conceive of the destruction of the great moral force that is connoted by the word character. "If the world is a rational, and therefore a moral system, it cannot be that this, the most precious thing we know, the only absolutely precious thing in the world, a character built up and matured in goodness through all the trials of life, should pass away and be lost for ever."

Character is "the only absolutely precious thing in the world," and it is at character that all these wonderful addresses are aimed. "Spiritual Development," "Purity," "Courage," phase after phase of the growth of character are dealt with. We can work out our own salvation here and now and save a soul worth saving. This does not really land us in the difficulty of conditional immortality. There may be repentance in the grave. But it does show us that the "existence of God carries with it the continued existence of those who have lived for His service."

• • • •
ELLICE HOPKINS.*

It seems almost impossible to the present generation, who are continually hearing of numerous societies started for helping and raising their weaker brethren, that less than one hundred years ago practically no such societies existed. The origins of these modern

* "Ellice Hopkins: a Memoir." By ROSE M. BARRETT, with Introduction by H. SCOTT HOLLAND, Canon of St. Paul's. (Messrs. Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., London. Price 3s. 6d. net.)

movements are always of vital interest, but few are more striking than the origins of the campaign against social impurity.

Ellice Hopkins, a pioneer in this work, was born in 1836, her father being a famous Cambridge mathematical tutor, who trained no less than twenty senior wranglers. Miss Hopkins owed much to the exceptional teaching she had from her father, and learnt from him "a habit of exact thought, and a determination to do well whatever she undertook. . . . The facility and clearness with which she expressed her thoughts won the admiration of many public speakers." Her first social work, beyond Sunday-school teaching, was among working men at Barnwell, and this proved so successful that she had as many as seven hundred working men at her meetings. Eventually, through her efforts, a Mission Hall and a Working Men's Institute were built for them. After her father's death in 1866, and the break up of the home, her own health failed, and she had to give up her work for a time. Miss Hopkins settled with her mother at Brighton, and it was there she came in contact with Mrs. Vicars, a converted Jewish lady, who had opened a home there for fallen girls. For some time she worked with Mrs. Vicars, and gained from the terribly sad experiences she went through much that was to help her later on in her great work.

While at Brighton Miss Hopkins came into touch with Miss Robinson, the "Soldiers' Friend," and a great friendship was struck up between them. To help Miss Robinson she wrote a stirring appeal for a Soldiers' Institute, which was eventually opened in 1874. It was in 1872 that Miss Hopkins came to know Dr. James Hinton, the eminent aurist and philosopher, and it was his influence that persuaded her to give up her life to try and rouse the nation to the horrible sore that was in its midst. Her life of James Hinton, published in 1878, is an able work, and ran through many editions. "For ten years, therefore, after my friend's death, I gave up everything for the purpose of carrying on the work he left me, holding meetings, organising practical work, agitating for the greater legal protection of the young, afterwards embodied in two Acts—one for removing children from dens of infamy, and one known as the Criminal Law Amendment Act—which have done much to educate the public sentiment of the country." The importance of this work it is difficult to estimate. In 1883 she was invited to address large meetings of men in many towns, and in February of that year Miss Hopkins, Bishop Lightfoot, and two other clergymen discussed a scheme that resulted in the "White Cross Army," which, later on, with the "Church of England Purity Society," became the "White Cross League Church of England Society." The society was taken up by all classes, especially at the first by

working men, and large meetings were held all over the country. Miss Hopkins' power of holding her audience was wonderful; she managed even from a hostile audience to gain their attention and sympathy at once. The League spread over sea to Australia, India, and America, and was taken up with enthusiasm everywhere. But the strain and anxiety of so many years were too much for such a delicate frame. In 1888 Miss Hopkins' health entirely broke down, and she had to give up all her work. She travelled for some time with her devoted secretary, Mrs. McIsaac, both abroad and in England, and, when her health permitted, wrote for the cause so dear to her, books and leaflets, which always had a ready sale. She suffered terribly from an internal malady the last year of her life, and died on August 15, 1904.

Referring to her death the *Guardian* wrote :—

“ She lived to see the movement she had initiated carried forward by powerful influence, and winning for itself support all along the line. . . . Her influence is to be seen in the changed attitude of the public mind towards some, at least, of the evils which, with great suffering to herself, she brought into the light of day.”

Indeed, to few men or women in any generation is it given to achieve such victories as hers. She prepared the way for the great campaigns of Mrs. Josephine Butler and Mr. Stead. She awakened a moral force in the community that was and is determined to grapple with and destroy the worst of the many evils that haunt great societies.

* * * *

• TIDES.

It often happens that the task of collecting and publishing the scattered writings of a scientific man is left to his biographer or literary executor, and to him it may be uncongenial, if not impossible, to follow accurately the line of thought of a master in his subject. In the case of Sir George Darwin, happily still with us, the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press have obviated the difficulty by offering to publish a collection of his mathematical papers, and the result is the volume now before us—the first of a series. Sir George Howard Darwin, second son of Charles Darwin, the famous naturalist, is Plumian Professor of Astronomy and Natural Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. He has been writing papers, principally on subjects dealing with the shape and changes of shape of the earth and other planets, which have been published in scientific journals, and it is these which are being republished in four volumes, the first being devoted to the papers on tides and their prediction.

* Scientific Papers, by Sir George Howard Darwin, K.C.B., F.R.S. Vol. I. Oceanic Tides and Lunar Disturbance of Gravity. Cambridge, 1907.

Beyond the vague generality that the tides depend on the moon, the ordinary person looking at a tide-table as at Bradshaw is doubtless quite ignorant how the figures are obtained. Though Sir George Darwin hardly endeavours to state the matter in a popular way, this work describes the methods and formulæ for tide-prediction. The various stages of the method may be defined as theoretical, observational, analytic, and synthetic. In the first place the theory of attraction is invoked to find the effect of the moon and sun, and from this the height of water at any time can be expressed by a formulæ consisting of the sum of a number of heights each multiplied by a quantity depending on the longitude of the sun, or moon, or on some other circumstance pertaining to these bodies at the time. In other words, the tide is represented theoretically by the sum of a number of waves and the amplitude of these, or the heights which are multiplied are to be found from observation. At first class ports for which accurate prediction is required, tide-gauges are set up, and their record gives a curve of some irregularity depicting the height of the tide at any time throughout the year. This is resolved by methods of harmonic analysis into constituent partial waves, and these observations therefore give the tidal constants, or the factors of the terms whose arguments depend on the moon and sun as above stated, for the particular port. The synthetic part of the operation consists in carrying on these constituent waves, and the sums of their combinations in the future are the tide predictions. The process once designed is mechanical, although some computing skill is required, and is, in fact, so mechanical that a machine has been designed and is effectively used to replace the human brain.

The second and shorter part of the book treats of possible small changes in the direction of the force of gravity, or in other words, the angular shift of a plumb line, which might be taken as evidence of a distortion of the solid part of the earth of the nature of a tide. Very careful experiments have been made by Sir George Darwin and his brother Horace in the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge, and by the late M. d'Abbadie in France with no very satisfactory proof of such a tide, although there seems to be very little doubt but that the surface of the earth has incessant small movements represented by waves of periods extending from the fraction of a second to a year. The changes annual and diurnal, which are unmistakably observed in the position of astronomical instruments, may be taken to be the result of meteorological causes, but beyond these the reasons for the minute throbbings of our mother-earth are not apparent. An interesting chapter closes the book, on the changes of the vertical near the sea shore due to the rise and fall of the tide. There are two reasons for this. One, the weight of the incoming water actually depresses the land on which it rests; and secondly, its own mass exerts an attractive force. This is especially perceptible in narrow channels, and Sir George Darwin is of opinion that if a gravitational observatory were established on the South coast of England, [apart from] seismic changes perceptible oscillations of the vertical would be noted.

THE ANNOTATED EDITION OF TENNYSON.*

Here we have the first two volumes of what may be regarded as the final and definitive edition of Tennyson's works, enriched in numberless ways by the annotations of their great author, and edited, with luminous notes, by the present Lord Tennyson, the author of the *Memoir of the poet*. We may, perhaps, regret that this edition has been so long delayed. Many readers and students of Tennyson in the fifteen years since the poet's death would have rejoiced in these invaluable annotations on individual poems; but no doubt questions of the preservation of copyright have intervened, for the growing estimate of Tennyson's poetry makes the right of reproduction one not only of high, but of increasing value. The poet, when he settled down to annotate his own work, was in an obvious difficulty.

"I am told that my young countrymen would like notes to my poems. Shall I write what dictionaries tell to save some of the idle folk trouble? or am I to try to fix a moral to each poem? or to add an analysis of passages? or to give a history of my similes? I do not like the task."

Mr. Birrell, in his edition of Browning's poems, calls attention to the dictum of Theobald, the Shakespearian commentator, that "the science of criticism, so far as it affects an editor, is reduced to three classes: 'the emendation of corrupt passages, the explanation of obscure and difficult ones, and an inquiry into the beauties and defects of style.'" A poet's commentary on his own work has to be even more diffident. Lord Tennyson could scarcely criticise his own style or emend his own text, but it was possible for him to deal with passages of known difficulty, and in this way he has cleared up doubts that would have existed as long as the works; while he has also explained a number of debatable points as to the origin of certain poems. Thus he tells us that "'The Moated Grange' was no particular grange, but one which rose to the music of Shakespeare's words: 'There, at the moated grange, resides the dejected Mariana' ('Measure for Measure,' Act iii., sc. i.)," and that "Locksley Hall" represents "an imaginary place and imaginary hero."

Tennyson always meant what he wrote, even in his earliest work. Thus in the "Recollections of the Arabian Nights" he wrote:—

"Aught my shallop, rustling thro'
The low and bloomed foliage, *drows* &
The fragrant, glistening deep, and clove
The citron-shadows in the blue";

* "Poems." Annotated by Alfred, Lord Tennyson. Edited by Hallam, Lord Tennyson. The Eversley Edition. Vols. I. and II. (Messrs. Macmillan & Co. Price 4s. net each.)

and he explains: "not 'drove over,' as one commentator takes it, but the passage means that the deeps were driven before the prow."

We have an interesting note on the "Ode to Memory," published in 1830, which the poet considered "One of the best of his early and peculiarly concentrated Nature-poems." The poet tells us that it was "a very early poem; all except the lines beginning 'My friend, with you to live alone,' which were addressed to Arthur Hallam, and added." In the same poem there are lines referring to Mablethorpe, and the poet tells us in his note that he "used to stand [when a boy] on the sand-built ridge at Mablethorpe and think that it was the spine-bone of the world. The seas there are interminable waves rolling along interminable shores of sand." An instance of Tennyson's close observation of Nature is shown in his little note on the lines in "Adeline":—

"And ye talk together still
In the language wherewith Spring
Letters cōwslips on the hill?"

He notes that the phrase "letters cōwslips" refers "to the red spots on the cowslip bell, as if they were letters of a fairy alphabet." He also notes that Shakespeare had recorded the same thing in "Cymbeline" (ii., 29):—

" . . . like the crimson drops
F' the bottom of a cowslip."

Another note is very characteristic of the poet:—

"I was one day walking with a friend in a copse, and I heard bird-laughter. I have no eyes, so to speak. He said, 'that's a jay.' It might have been a woodpecker, as far as my ears could tell. However, whether he was right in his eyesight or I in my hearing, I did once catch a jay in the act of laughing. I once crept with the greatest caution through a wood and came right underneath a jay. I heard him chuckling to himself; and the afternoon sun was full upon him. I broke by chance a little rotten twig of the tree he was perched on, and away he went."

Notes of this kind throw a keen light on the poet's nature and thoroughness of observation. His passage on the cicada is of the same type: "In the heat of the noon the cicada is generally at its loudest, though I have read that, in extreme heat, it is silent. Someone (I forget who) found them silent at noon on the slopes of Etna. In the Pyrenees, where part of this poem ['Oenone'] was written, I saw a very beautiful species of cicada, which had scarlet wings spotted with black. Probably nothing of the kind exists in Mount Ida." Again, in the same poem, he explains the line

"And at their feet the crocus brake like fire"

by stating that "It is the flame-like petal of the crocus which is alluded to, not only the colour." An interesting point as to the daffodil is brought out by the editor. The poet writes: "*Asphodel*, a sort of lily. The word 'daffodil' is said to be derived from 'asphodel.'" Lord Tennyson confirms this from the French phrase "*Fleur d'asphodèle*." The poet went always to Nature for his inspiration: "I often, as I say, chronicle on the spot, in four or five words or more, whatever strikes me as picturesque in Nature."

But it was not Nature alone nor Art alone that made Tennyson the force that he is in literature and national life. The wonderful year 1833, when his genius suddenly blossomed—a year as wonderful for him as 1809 was for Wordsworth—saw him reaching out to high idealism. Before that date Trench had said to him: "Tennyson, we cannot live in Art," and the poet embodied this truth in his "Palace of Art." This poem, he tells us, after the lapse of long years, "is the embodiment of my own belief that the God-like life is with man and for man." Love, to Tennyson as to Dante, is the supreme fact that explains the universe and constitutes the true relationship of man to man and man to God. No poet can be great in the secular sense unless he is cultivating, beyond or rather within his sense of beauty and grasp of Nature, a moral force. That Tennyson was, and therefore, as a poet, he must live.

The early work that is preserved certainly substantiates this claim. Despite much criticism, there can be no doubt that the prize poem "Timbuctoo" is rightly reprinted here. It is much older than the year 1829, when it was published. In fact, it was an old poem on "The Battle of Armageddon," patched up and renamed. "Matthew Arnold told G. L. Craik that when, as a youth, he first read the poem, he prophesied the greatness of Tennyson." But Tennyson certainly became an artist, and he worked at his material with infinite patience. He had, as the note here shows, a specialist's knowledge of Arthur; but all his care was to secure the fulfilment of the high didactic purpose of his poems. "The whole of my 'Idylls' is the dream of man coming into practical life and ruined by one sin. Birth is a mystery and death is a mystery, and in the midst lies the tableland of life, and its struggles and performances. It is not the history of one man, or of one generation, but of a whole cycle of generations." Tennyson was, indeed, at heart a teacher and a prophet.

We must finally call attention to the one or two very interesting poems now printed for the first time in these notes. The lines "Home," written in 1828, beginning—

and ending—
 “What shall sever me
 From the love of home?”

“Tho’ I could not tell
 My left hand from my right,—
 I should know thee well,
 Home of my delight!”

are very properly printed here, as are the exquisite verses of Sir Lancelot’s Courtship, noted by Fitzgerald. We must also welcome, in an Appendix, the present Lord Tennyson’s quite perfect English hexameters. They were in some measure due to his father.

ENGLISH MUSIC.*

Dr. Walker has set out to write a history of English music from the standpoint of the musician rather than that of the antiquarian or biographer. A book of this kind was much wanted, and the author has produced a work which will be valuable to the scholar without losing its interest for the amateur. Dr. Walker is, inevitably, deeply impressed with the salient facts of his rather melancholy story. He sees England, under John Dunstable, the pioneer of Europe in the creation of modern music at the beginning of the fifteenth century. He sees after a temporary lapse the great names of Tye, Whyte, and Tallis, to which succeeds the extraordinary efflorescence of the Elizabethan madrigal writers and the splendid achievements in ecclesiastical music of Byrd and Gibbons. After that comes the Renaissance of the Restoration, which saw the emergence of the art into the full air of secularity and publicity, and the rise of the supreme and versatile genius of Purcell. Here, one would think, was the foundation laid for a great and rapid development of an English school of music, but instead of this the historian is confronted with the alien despotism of Handel, which dominated musical England for, one may say, a century and a half, only to be succeeded by an equally sterile subservience to another great foreigner, Mendelssohn. After this comes, like a ray of sunshine, the birth of the modern English school. The story is, it has been said, a depressing one, and the contemplation of it has to some extent prejudiced Dr. Walker’s exposition. His narration of the history previous to Handel is wonderfully full and sympathetic. Handel himself, though Dr. Walker is too good a musician not to recognise his obvious genius, is less fairly treated. His instrumental music is dismissed in half a page, only a few pieces being deemed worthy of specific commendation. The wonderful violin sonata in A major is, for instance, just mentioned

* “A History of Music in England.” By Ernest Walker. (Clarendon Press, 1907.)

as "music that arrests and fixes the attention." Again, the duet, "The Lord is a man of war," is dismissed as conventional, without any consideration of such finely dramatic phrases as the setting of "His chosen captains," &c. So, too, Arne is "a somewhat small man possessed of one special talent; by which alone he lives . . . the gift of pleasant, fresh tunefulness." It is the same with all the composers of these two lamentable intermediate centuries. Practically the only two who come in for any positive appreciation are the Wesleys, the elder of whom was a strenuous opposer of Handel, and is not without resemblance to the early ecclesiastical composers. Attwood's music is "quite enjoyable in its mild way." Bishop had some slender talents, but only squandered them. Hatton has a "slight but pleasant talent." "To Anthea," though greatly overrated, is "quite pleasant, cleanly written work." Sterndale Bennett is put very little higher. Sullivan plainly had a vitality and technical equipment which might have done something to raise English music to the level of the real masters; but it seems doubtful if he ever achieved anything likely to be permanent in the higher branches of his art. A pardonable irritation at this failure leads Dr. Walker to the most palpable injustice in the whole volume—his treatment of the Savoy operas. When, however, we come to the modern English school, gratitude and hope quicken the historian's sympathies once more, and he writes with an insight as ardent and true as that which marks his treatment of the pre-Handelians. For adequate reasons given in the preface, he deals only with five living composers, Mackenzie, Cowen, Parry, Stanford, and Elgar. His criticism is in every case admirable, the appreciation of Parry being especially welcome at a time when the real value of that composer's work is in danger of being obscured by the pretensions of a younger and more clamorous generation. That of Elgar (though his faults are clearly noted) is perhaps a little coloured by the writer's general bias.

The book ends with a careful chapter on Folk-music, and one on general characteristics. It is profusely illustrated throughout with musical quotations, and is full of much new and useful matter. In particular, one may hope that Dr. Walker's indication of the disgraceful amount of work by our greatest composers remaining unpublished may bear fruit.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

"The Life of George Mathieson" (Hodder and Stoughton, Price 7s. 6d.), by Dr. D. Macmillan, the minister of Kelvinhaigh Parish, Glasgow, is not only a work of real merit but of historical importance, for the part played in the modern history of the Church of Scotland

by Dr. Mathieson was great indeed. He was born on March 27th, 1842, just before the great Disruption, and died on August 28th, 1906, after having given a new life to his church. To sound scholarship and philosophy he united the eloquence of Spurgeon and Parker, and he bequeathed to the world a series of published works which will long continue his influence. His volume entitled "Aids to the Study of German Theology" appeared in 1874. This was followed by "The Growth of the Spirit of Christianity," "an application of the principles of Hegel to the Christian Church; in short, it was a philosophy of the Church from 'the Dawn of the Christian Era to the Reformation.'" In 1878 he became a valued contributor to this *Review*, and to other periodic publications such as *The Expositor*. It is interesting to note the spiritual struggle that this great man underwent. He stated some ten years ago that, shortly after his ordination at Innellan, "I believed nothing; neither God nor immortality." The Highland Presbytery drily remarked that he was young and would change. "I have changed." Strangely enough it was the philosophy of Hegel, introduced to him by Dr. Caird, that brought the change. "Without hypocrisy I preach all the old doctrines, and use all the old forms, but with deeper meaning. . . . I am as broad as can be, but it is a broad positive." Hegel is not always so favoured. Dr. Mathieson's profound study of philosophy, including the English school of Deism, stood him in good stead and played a great part in the formation of a spiritual outlook that cleared away unsubstantial doubts as sunlight clears away mist. All doubt left him as years passed on. This blind author and preacher had a spiritual vision intense and penetrating. "He believed as strongly in the immortality of the soul as he did in his own personality. . . . The very idea of God made it necessary to his thinking, and the Christian doctrine would fall to pieces were the doctrine of immortality to be blotted out. . . . In the Incarnation, God manifest in the flesh, Mathieson finds the Christian idea both as God and man." "The Christ of history was to him the Christ of experience." Of Dr. Mathieson as a preacher we cannot write here, but all may and should read the vivid description of his power and eloquence in Dr. Macmillan's admirable book. But one pulpit phrase (at St. Bernard's) we must quote: speaking of a certain phenomenon, he exclaimed, "Herbert Spencer would call it the vibration of the ether; I would call it the heaving breast of God."

* * *

The new edition of Burge's "Commentaries on Colonial and Foreign Laws" (Messrs. Sweet and Maxwell, Price 25s.), promises to be a work of considerable importance and great usefulness if we may judge from the introductory volume recently issued under the general editorship of Messrs. A. W. Renton and G. G. Phillimore, and entitled, "Colonial Laws and Courts." Such a work as this volume is indispensable to every lawyer and jurist who has to deal with questions of the conflict of laws. In the old days, before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was formed in 1833, the Master of the Rolls, exercising the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Privy Council on Colonial questions, was compelled on questions of foreign law to take the opinion of foreign lawyers and abide by it. It was the practice, says Mr. C. E. A. Bedwell, the Assistant-Librarian at the Middle Temple Library,

in his excellent introduction to the book, to send the papers in the case when a question of Roman-Dutch law was involved "to a lawyer in Holland whose opinion was adopted as the decision of the Court." This was extremely unsatisfactory. Even after the Judicial Committee was formed there were no text-books or judges with special knowledge to assist the Court until Mr. William Burge, Q.C., in 1838, utilised his great experience in the production of his Commentaries which "still remain the only legal work which attempts to deal comparatively with the main divisions of the law of persons and property in the systems of the British dominions and those of foreign countries." To-day our Colonial and Indian systems of government and law have varied greatly from their counterparts when William IV. was king. Since then India has passed to the Crown and her laws have been codified; in South Africa Roman-Dutch law now operates over an area of one million square miles, occupied by ten million British subjects; since Mr. Burge's time the great colonies have become not only self-governing but in many instances federated, while ex-territorial jurisdiction, which was a matter of small importance in 1838, now requires an extensive system of law. It was therefore necessary to extend the scope of the work and to add a sketch, a very illuminating though somewhat disconnected sketch, "of the main legal systems of the world and their modern evolution, especially the general movement towards codification." The historical material is, on the whole, well handled within narrow limits, and enables the reader to see clearly enough how this or that system or code of laws came into being. Ample authority for both the history of the evolution of law and the statements as to current law is given, and the student who desires to go deeply into any particular point has the best sources indicated. The account of the evolution of Spanish law—which still obtains in Trinidad—is admirable. It is for the most part due to Mr. Burge himself. It is interesting to note that the jurists and lawyers of the South American Republics still cite the text of the four "Partidas" (the mediæval code formulated in the thirteenth century in Spain) in support of points of law arising on their respective codes. Probably the best piece of work in the book, certainly the most difficult to write, is the monograph on Roman-Dutch law by Dr. W. R. Bisschop, assisted by Dr. J. E. Heeres. The evolution of legal systems in the Netherlands is treated with learning and elaboration, and it is with something more than curiosity that one sees the slow but inevitable mingling of the people's law and the civil law into the Roman-Dutch law "of which the Roman law formed the framework and the most important portion, with Dutch additions, consisting of judgments, local laws and customs." The learned jurists of Leyden kept Roman law alive, tested by the ordinary occurrences of daily life." They gave indeed an old jurisprudence to a new world of settlers in Asia, America and Africa, and in doing so took a place in the history of jurisprudence not less important than that of Napoleon himself. The only criticisms we are inclined to level at the work are a somewhat noticeable absence of coherence between the parts and the incomplete consideration of the Canon law. The subject is still very important. We cannot, moreover, bring ourselves to believe the statement that prior to the Reformation the general Canon law was only effective in Scotland in so far as it was adopted by Provincial Councils.

* * *

It is rarely that so much of general interest is to be found in a Diary as in that (*William Allingham: A Diary*, Messrs. Macmillan & Co., price 12s. net) from which Mrs. Allingham and Mrs. Ernest Radford have made such excellent selections. The short autobiography shows the influence on the poet's nature of the wistful charm of the Irish coast, and the little town where he was born. A gentle, dreamy boy, his childhood tranquil, if not joyous, he was taken from school at fourteen and placed in the bank at Ballyshannon. This early break in his studies was a deep regret to him. At twenty-two he was appointed Inspector of Customs, a post which he held, with one short interruption, till 1870, when he was offered the sub-editorship of "*Fraser's Magazine*." In that year he married Miss Helen Paterson and settled at Chelsea. Allingham's youthful worship of Tennyson led him to send his first poem to the latter, who soon after made his acquaintance. When, in 1863, Allingham was appointed to Lymington this acquaintance ripened into warm friendship. At Freshwater he met all those best worth knowing in England at that time, and upon all his comments are often keen and always generous. A narrow escape of the MS. of "*In Memoriam*" is told. Tennyson wrote it in a thing like a butcher's account book, left it in his lodgings in London, and wrote to Coventry Patmore to look for it. It was found in a drawer. A few hours later it would have been destroyed. In this present juncture it is interesting to read that as long ago as 1865 Tennyson considered that "England ought to draw her colonies closer, and that their representatives should sit in London, either in, or in connection with, the Imperial Parliament." Tennyson's criticisms on Browning, Browning's on Tennyson, and Carlyle's on both, are among the best of the many good things in the book. The portraits of her husband by Mrs. Allingham are very sympathetic, and confirm the impression, given by the Diary, of a sincere, refined nature, with high and pure ideals steadily pursued. Those of Tennyson and Carlyle are equally good, those of Carlyle being undoubtedly the best taken of their rugged subject, and so considered by him.

* * *

Messrs. J. M. Dent and Co. have added to their "*Temple Greek and Latin Classics*" a translation into English verse of Horace's Odes and Epodes, by Mr. John Marshall, Rector of the Royal High School, Edinburgh. The Latin and English are printed side by side, and there is a useful appendix of critical notes. The whole makes a very pleasant book. Mr. Marshall recognises that a translation must, to be of any value, be absolutely faithful, and he contrives none the less to write good English and good verse. This is perhaps all a translator of Horace can hope to achieve. Calverley managed to add some of his peculiar charm to his few versions, and Francis' renderings are still readable for themselves, but no one has yet succeeded in really reproducing the Odes.

* * *

"*The Factory and Shop Acts of the British Dominions*" (Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode, Price 2s. 6d. net) is the title of an admirable

handbook, compiled by Miss Violet R. Markham, and issued by the Industrial Sub-committee of the Victoria League. The volume opens with a striking preface by Mrs. H. J. Tennant, followed by a "General View of the English Law" on the subject. This book is an excellent example of the work now so strenuously advocated by the Society of Comparative Legislation—the comparison side by side of legislation dealing with similar evils under various conditions and skies. Our Colonies have much to learn from our legislation. As Mrs. Tennant points out, "the Mother Country can show to the younger countries by her longer and frequently bitter experience, the errors to avoid. . . . It is easier to resist at the beginning than at the end." Australia and New Zealand have seen this in the case of sweating, and have checked it "in its beginnings with admirable promptness and vigorous determination." In New Zealand, sub-contracting in textile work is effectively prohibited, while factory work *must* be done *in* the factory. Finished articles or garments not made in a factory must bear a conspicuous label "which shows the intending purchaser that it was made up in a private dwelling-place or uninspected workshop." We recommend this book very heartily. It is clearly written; it gives the fullest information as to the law in Australia, New Zealand, and Canada; and shows how much we have to learn from colonial experiments. It is, however, surprising to find that in Queensland "there is no restriction on employment after childbirth."

* * *

The Report of the Outer London Inquiry Committee on West Ham, compiled by Mr. Edward G. Howarth and Miss Mona Wilson, is an elaborate "Study in Social and Industrial Problems" (Messrs. J. M. Dent & Co.). We can but notice the issue of this important work, which will take its place as an invaluable contribution to the economic history of Outer London. It deals (after presenting a historical sketch from Domesday Book onwards) first with the data of the Housing Problem in West Ham. Good management is at the root of the housing problem in many districts. The present writer as a trustee of a public charity, has seen a slum street turned into a respectable district by good management through a competent agent. Long leases ruin neighbourhoods; rack-renting by responsible freeholders is always the most desirable form of holding. The volume deals secondly, and very elaborately, with employment and wages in West Ham. The district has attracted many manufacturers, and this has given a special character to the area. It is near London by road, it has good and cheap waterways, land is cheap, the district possesses docks and railways, and, when manufacturers moved in, rates were comparatively low. These facts account for the present characteristics of the borough. The increase of rates is said to have driven manufacturers away, but there is little evidence of this, and we can scarcely believe that this would outweigh the other numerous advantages. This section of the work is very full and valuable, but not more so than the section dealing with Local Government in West Ham. We note that the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, has

not worked well. It has merely tended to perpetuate irregularity of employment. Chronic under-employment cannot be ended by legislation. Employers must themselves abandon casual employment.

* * *

Mr. A. E. Dobbs' "Philosophy and Popular Morals in Ancient Greece" (Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1907) is an expansion of the essay which won the Hare Prize in 1906. The sub-title of the book is "An Examination of Popular Morality and Philosophic Ethics in their Interrelations and Reciprocal Influence in Ancient Greece down to the Close of the Third Century B.C." The influence of popular morality on philosophical speculation has, as Mr. Dobbs admits, already been the subject of much consideration, and he does little more than summarise the results of others in this department, without attempting to throw much new light on the subject himself. He is evidently more at home in tracing the actual development of philosophical thought, the accounts of Plato and Aristotle being full, accurate, and impartial. The succeeding schools of Sceptic, Epicurean, and Stoic are more shortly, indeed, much too shortly, treated. Mr. Dobbs has, perhaps, been misled into estimating their immediate influence by their ultimate value to the development of philosophic thought. The reflex action of philosophical ethics on popular morality has not been much considered before, and when one reads Mr. Dobbs' conclusions on the subject, one is not surprised, for this branch of his work produces very little positive result, though this collection of the material is most full and careful, and should prove of value. Indeed, Mr. Dobbs' book has throughout the inevitable faults of the Prize Essay. It is all sound, careful work, very laborious and accurate, but it shows the influence of the set subject. Exception should, however, be made of his treatment of Plato and the Sophists, which is clear and sane, and to some extent new. The argument is throughout plentifully supported by references, and the book should prove a useful text-book.

NOTES.

The analysis issued by *The Publishers' Circular* of books published during the past year presents some remarkable figures, though some of the increases may be ascribed to the attainment of greater completeness in the weekly lists. Works of theology numbered 792 new books and 158 new editions, as compared with 628 and 109 respectively in 1906. Educational books and works of fiction both show a decrease, except as regards new editions of the latter. Law and jurisprudence is one of the departments which shows the largest proportional increase. This is chiefly attributable to the fact that the law publishers make use of the list issued by *The Publishers' Circular* to a greater extent than was formerly the custom. At the same time, there has been considerable activity in that field of literature, and there is a tendency for others to enter it in competition with the group of publishers located near the Law Courts.

Books classified as "Arts, Sciences, and Illustrated Works," have increased from 452 to 863, and in new editions from 47 to 246. Poetry shows a decrease, but a larger demand for standard authors. Medicine, History, and Geography all help to swell the total, which is placed at 7,701, as compared with 6,985, and of new editions there were 2,213, being 495 in excess of 1906.

* * *

An interesting section in Mr. Quaritch's latest list of books contains twenty-five items under the heading "Autographs." Among them are nine little manuscript books, of which six were written by Charlotte Brontë and three by her brother, Patrick Branwell. During the years 1829 and 1830 the Brontë children amused themselves by writing a "magazine," of which these books formed a part. Another item is the original manuscript of Gladstone's "Home Rule for Ireland," together with the corrected proof sheets of the pamphlet, and a third is Miss Kate Greenaway's draft of "A Day in a Child's Life," with her sketches for the work. Each of these is priced at one hundred guineas. Included in this series is the agreement signed by Sir Walter Scott with Messrs. Constable & Co. respecting the copyright of "Ivanhoe," "The Monastery," "The Abbot," and "Kenilworth."

* * *

Among the books held over from the autumn publishing season was a large work on the Procedure of the House of Commons. It is a translation by Mr. A. E. Steinthal from the German by Professor Redlich, of the University of Vienna, whose treatise on Local Government in England was well received in this country. The present study, which has an introduction and supplementary chapter by Sir Courtenay Ilbert, Clerk to the House of Commons, may be regarded as superseding, to some extent, Dr. Gneist's well-known text-book. Dr. Redlich has doubts whether Parliamentary government is a satisfactory method of conducting the affairs of a sovereign people, and opens a series of studies on the subject by dealing with the Mother of Parliaments. *Appropos* of his subject may be mentioned a Parliamentary white paper recently printed for the information of the House of Commons, in which particulars are given of the constitutions of the second chambers and the conflicts which have occurred between the two houses of the representative assemblies upon the Continent.

* * *

The suggestion was made recently in *The Times* (December 26) that a combined catalogue of the Colonial, Indian, American, and foreign law books in the twelve London libraries which pay special attention to these subjects would be useful. The proposal opens up the consideration of the more extended work of what may be called co-operative cataloguing. At present there is no system in this country comparable to the method adopted in the Library of Congress at Washington. Although wider in its scope and use than the British Museum Library, it is similar for this purpose in being the storehouse of copyright books. Every volume issued is catalogued and the entry printed on cards which can be supplied to any library in the States. Thus the resources of the

national library are placed at the disposal of the smallest institution and considerable economy effected in one department of current expense. The cards which are required may be selected either by receiving galley-strips of the whole issue or by sending particulars sufficient to identify the books to the Librarian of Congress. Nearly eight hundred subscribers have availed themselves of this plan, more than one-half being public libraries. One obstacle to its general adoption here is the fact that the system of card-cataloguing is not so extensively in use in this country, but this co-operative scheme points to a breadth of view and union among different types of libraries which is not always conspicuous in English library administration.

* * *

The Bow Church Magazine, the first issue of which has been sent us by the Rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, the Rev. Arthur W. Hutton, takes a form somewhat unusual in parochial publications, for, in future, it will not only contain brief articles on subjects of liturgical importance (such as the article on the "Amendment in the Use of the Psalter" in the current number) and occasional sermons, but will also insert notes or answers to queries dealing with matters of historical interest relating to the parish, or even of wider extent. Mr. Hutton writes: "I should like the field to be a wide one, and to include Biblical, ecclesiastical, historical, liturgical and other points." The idea is excellent. Every parish magazine in the country might well adopt it, and so provide a means of recording local information, possibly of very great value, on archaeological and historical matters. Every magazine so conducted would have great educational value.

* * *

We have received the following communication from Lord Salisbury the Chairman of the Hospitality Committee of the Pan-Anglican Conference:—

I venture to ask you to insert the following statement of the Hospitality Committee of the Pan-Anglican Congress. A very large number of members and delegates are coming to England this year from all parts of the world to take part in the Congress to be held from June 15 to 24, 1908. In addition to this, the Archbishop of Canterbury has requested the Committee to undertake the arrangements for the entertainment of those bishops from abroad, attending the Lambeth Conference July 3 to August 5. It is thought that many will be willing to avail themselves of this opportunity of offering hospitality to their fellow churchmen from abroad. It is not only in London that hospitality will be required, but offers from other parts of England, both town and country, will be welcome both before and after the dates mentioned above. All such offers should be sent as soon as possible to the Hon. Secretaries, Hospitality Committee, Pan-Anglican Congress, Church House, Westminster, S.W.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. POETRY AND MODERN THOUGHT. By "MUSEUS"	1
2. REVIEWS	4
SIR HENRY WOTTON. THE MODERN CHURCH. MR. FREDERIC HARRISON'S "PHILOSOPHY OF COMMON SENSE." WIRELESS TELEPHONY. PROFESSOR ELTON'S ESSAYS. SIR GEORGE GREY. JAMES THOMSON.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS: The Great Scheme of the West, etc.	17
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS AND NOTES	20

POETRY AND MODERN THOUGHT.

EVERY new age has its new poetry; has, so to speak, its own music, the passionate voice of the spirit that lives and moves in the multitudinous activities of the time. Youth must sing; the springtime is full of voices; winter and night are over and past. The history of every literature is evidence of this. Great social events, great changes in the life of society, are accompanied by a total change of outlook and inlook, so far as literature is concerned. Neither change, indeed, is immediate. Looking backward, we can see that events in society and in literature which seemed so sudden as to startle all living observers were, in fact, the results of long ages of preparation. The Reformation agitated the minds of men almost two centuries before it was an accomplished fact; and for the roots of the Renaissance we must peer as deep into the backward of time. The English social reforms of the nineteenth century and the return to nature in literature by which they were accompanied find their origins possibly as far back as the late seventeenth century, when men first began, in modern times, to realize the horrors that are involved in social congestion, and the need of close contact with nature. It is, indeed, unnecessary to labour the point that fundamental, social, and literary changes go together. It is a commonplace of history.

To-day we find ourselves amid a new revolution, a revolution in thought that men a century ago would have refused to regard as possible. To-day is the day of science, of *knowing*. We investigate all things, and, not the least, ourselves; science has extended her field from Nature to man, and is peering upward from Man to God. It is not an age of speculation, but of investigation and exact thought. The microscope of the mind is turned upon the intimate structure of things, the ultimate nature of matter, the limits and scope of ideas. The whence and whither of man the individual, and of the race, are the subjects of tireless investigation, and the meaning of our existence is approached as a subject of legitimate inquiry. The methods of

exact thought are applied to every problem that can present itself. The data are exposed and ranged in order, and we realize as never before that the mysteries of life and death interpenetrate us from every side. It is no longer a question of a little clear space in which we can move and act without heeding the impenetrable mysteries that surround this narrow field of action. We are not surrounded by mysteries but are mysteries; the solid earth affords us no indefeasible foothold, the gleaming stars no certain steering light, the responsive conscience no directive and undeviating compass. The Absolutes of yesterday are altered; but not by doubt or speculation, not by infidelity or pessimism or evil, not by any subjective disclaimer of doctrine or the mind-searchings of pure philosophy, or the notions of pure mathematics. They are altered by the accumulation and collation of phenomena, and the enunciation of principles flowing from endless observations. Earth-stuff and Mind-stuff and Soul-stuff are in the laboratory in order that men may probe for the secret springs of things. As Jacob wrestled with the angel, so man to-day is wrestling with Nature, and till she answers our "obstinate questionings" we will not let her go. That this age is suffering in the struggle there can be little doubt. The faith of good men halts where once it ran smooth and swift. Nay, the very penalty of the Garden too often is ours. We forget immortality in the mortal struggle. We look for this life to give us things that are not within its gift.

But the case to-day is very different to the case of even thirty years ago. Then we were still in the hands of the logicians, of the clear, dry thinkers who loved their logic, and had no doubts about their premises, who distributed their conclusions to the schools that they controlled, and made gods in their own image—the creatures of their minds. To-day it is the premises that matter: logic is quite capable of taking care of itself. We are not concerned about conclusions; we have no desire to argue a case; our business is Knowledge. Therefore the sense of reverence is awake once more. The ground we walk, the stars we watch, the mind we use, the conscience we bear, are each and all sacred. Their mysteries are our life, our stronghold, and our hope. The deeper we peer into these mysteries, the more stoutly we clear away the obstacles that lie between us and the depths within which these mysteries are enshrined, the more fully do we realise that the Powers which play about us are full of meaning and purpose, the more clearly do we appreciate that this world of Thing and Thought is a word of Order and of Love, and that all which our senses acknowledge are but the garments of conscious and invisible realities.

It may be said that this is pure mysticism, and that mysticism and modern thought lie poles asunder. But, after all, what is mysticism? Is it not that sense of something real, unchangeable, and conscious behind "the flux of mortal things," which is to a

certain type of personality like a sixth sense? When Dante wrote the famous line:

E la sua volontate è nostra pace;

when Thomas à Kempis wrote: "In hac pace, in idipsum, hoc est, in "Te unto summo et aeterno Bono, dormiam et requiesciam"; when Augustine described the famous moment at the window in Ostia and added: "Suppose we heard Him without any intermediary at "all—just now we reached out, and with one flash of thought touched "the Eternal Wisdom that abides above all—suppose this endured ". . . might not eternal life be like this moment of comprehension"; they were each touching in their mystic way the very realities that modern thought, with its subtle analysis and reconstruction, is dimly feeling after. There is nothing unscientific in the mysticism of the great mystics. They claim to know without the intermediary of a logical process, and to know more abundantly. It might once have been said that it was merely a claim, but to-day it would be difficult to say this, for the whole drift of modern thought goes to show us within the machinery of things an undeviating Will which is our peace, the Eternal Wisdom that Augustine and Monica touched in their "moment of comprehension." It is no mere fancy of the dreamer: long enough ago Aristotle declared that on the ascending scale of creation "we reach at last the rational life of "man, who at least in the pure activity of contemplation can directly "participate in the eternal and divine." To modern thinkers "pure "activity of contemplation" has a practical meaning that may appeal to those who are repelled by the term "mysticism." Yet the rational life of man to-day has brought us into touch with mysteries that are hard to distinguish from the mysteries of the mystics. Perhaps mysticism and modern thought are poles asunder: poles are curiously related.

In some such way modern thought is beginning to regard this wonderful but shrouded world. It remains for the New Poetry to awaken and give voice in song to the thoughts of the New Age. That a school of poets with such an epic to make will appear we dare not doubt, for the human intellect has never before soared in such daring flights as those in which it soars to-day: and the song accompanies the worker. Nothing, as we have said, is sudden. Modern thought on the mysteries of mind and matter has been slowly moving since the days of Newton, and all along the road the singer has sung. Poet after poet has felt the mysteries of life in a way not known before. They turned to "Nature's old felicities." Their hearts "leapt up "when they beheld a rainbow in the sky!" The poet grew more and more attuned to the things that lie within or behind nature. He was no longer out of tune with reality. Shelley, Coleridge, Wordsworth brought us back at a bound to the realities of nature, and

to the "thoughts too deep for tears" lying within those realities. Browning and Tennyson took us further in some, indeed, in many ways: brought the mass of things in relation to a Central Idea of love and goodness. God became once more the dominant note in literature—the Invisible shone through the visible. Faith gathered, and is faster and faster to-day gathering strength, for she finds that the destruction by knowledge of many apparent strongholds has proved gain, not loss; that it is in the long run, not only nobler but safer to fight in the open field. So the New Poetry has its part to play, its necessary function to perform. It can justify Faith while it encourages knowledge, finding all the while its sources of inspired song in the wider world that knowledge opens to her eyes, in the purer religion that faith has given to her heart. It can then, indeed, describe for men:

"Glory—beyond all glory ever seen,
"Confusion infinite of heaven and earth
"Dazzling the soul";

and give the world

 "an assured belief
"That the procession of our fate, how'er
"Sad or disturbed, is ordered by a Being
"Of infinite benevolence and power;
"Whose everlasting purposes embrace
"All accidents, converting them to good."

MUSEUS.

SIR HENRY WOTTON.*

It is not easy to review in any adequate fashion within a narrow space Mr. Pearsall Smith's monumental work on Sir Henry Wotton and his times. In these two volumes the loving labour of many years is concentrated, and so thorough is the workmanship that in every page the reader and student of the early seventeenth century must feel that he has left the thinner air of modern times and is in an environment strange and new and yet familiar. Mr. Pearsall Smith's mind is so saturated with the daily life, the daily thought, the daily aspirations and ambitions of the days when Elizabeth and James were on the English throne, that we walk with him in a strange land—a strange Europe, a strange England—of which we have read in books but which we have never visited before. Here we have the life of Henry Wotton, who was born on March 30th, 1568, and died on December 5th, 1639, as Provost of Eton, after a life of European adventure rarely vouchsafed to man. The story is told

* "The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton," by Logan Pearsall Smith. In two volumes. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press).

incomparably well. Naught is set down in favour or in malice. The man with all his virtues and with all his faults lives before us. Mr. Pearsall Smith's estimate of Wotton's character is higher than we should have cared to place it. We rather join with those who "less friendly than Donne, watched Wotton with the distrust of the traditional '*Inglese Italianato*'—with a certain suspicion of his 'sincerity and good faith.'" We may on the evidence doubt if he treated the great Casaubon well. On Wotton's first visit to the Continent (1589-1594) he spent fourteen months in the immortal scholar's house, and the two men became friends indeed. "Oh, that 'was life worth living! pure happiness! I cannot recall those times 'without groaning in spirit,'" wrote Casaubon in 1601. But despite such friendship Wotton left Casaubon in the spring of 1594 responsible for a sum exceeding 263 gold crowns, and before the scholar, more than a year later, recovered his money and freed himself from Wotton's creditors he was reduced to the depths of despair. It was a monstrous business and, despite all Mr. Pearsall Smith's explanations, characteristic of Wotton. No doubt each instance has some explanation, but the cumulative effect is unpleasant. Two examples may be noted. Essex became Wotton's patron, and they sailed together on the Cadiz and Azores expeditions; but when the favourite's fall was at hand Wotton frankly fled in time to the safety of Italy. On the second Italian expedition he became acquainted with Alessandro Antelminelli, who was hiding himself from the professional assassins of the little Lucchese Republic under the name of Amerigo Salvetti. That the two men became close friends there can be no doubt; yet some years later, when Wotton was the English Ambassador at Venice, he was perfectly ready to do this friend an irreparable injury for a small political gain. Mr. Pearsall Smith does not attempt to defend this incident. It was perhaps as unnecessary to defend the shameless and smooth lying by which the Ambassador at Venice promoted his policy of separating Venice from the Catholic Powers and of fomenting a Protestant movement in the heart of Italy.

But enough of criticism of this type. Wotton was a man of his age, an age when loyalty to friends was not a well understood virtue among great men, an age when the methods advocated by the school of Machiavelli poisoned the wells of polity. Wotton was nothing if he was not an Italianate Elizabethan, who revelled in the subtle political methods of his time; but he was as well a sturdy English Puritan, who hated Pope and Popery with a hatred that only the next generation could fully appreciate. Wotton must have delighted in the incongruity of the two phases in his nature, an incongruity which he was admirably pleased to display in action. A fugitive from England as the friend of Essex, he suddenly appears in Scotland as the Ambassador to King James VI. of the

Grand Duke of Tuscany: appears not as Henry Wotton but as Ottavio Baldi, speaking the purest Italian, and only revealing himself in private to the man who was about to become King of England. This astonishing adventure underlay all his subsequent good fortune, for James never forgot Ottavio, who, in wonted fashion, speedily reconciled himself to Cecil on the accession of the King. Ambassador thrice to Venice, once to The Hague, and once to Ferdinand II. he was one, indeed, whom James delighted to honour. He certainly magnified in Europe the position of England, and it may be said that his policy first gave this country entrance to the Mediterranean.

Wotton was truly a great and characteristic figure in a great period. In modern times he would have found his sphere of work in India, and would have made a superb organiser of secret service. In his own day he was a magnificent personality, with something of the bluff and bravado of his age, but, at the same time, instinct with the political spirit of the Reformation and touched with the glowing genius of the Renaissance. Did he not read Greek with the mighty Casaubon, study theology with the deathless Sarpi, sing with the Elizabethan singing birds, conspire with Essex, plot with the Venetian greybeards, talk with Milton, fish with Walton? It seems almost impossible to believe that the man who sang

"This man is freed from servile bands
 "Of hope to rise, or fear to fall;—
 "Lord of himself, though not of lands,
 "And having nothing, yet hath all,"

proposed to sell his friend Amerigo Salvetti for a tainted mess of political pottage. But of such make were the man and his age. To reconstruct such a personality was Mr. Pearsall Smith's task, and he has fulfilled it in a fashion that quite exceeds expectation. It is not merely a question of fine writing or of character painting. His edition of characteristic letters (including much unpublished material) is of the highest historical value, and is done in such a fashion, and with such scholarly precision, that it alone makes his two volumes a necessary part of every library that deals with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These letters reveal the age in a way that no other material could reveal it. In addition to these invaluable documents we have in an appendix "a list of Sir Henry Wotton's writings, and "of letters, printed and unprinted, arranged as accurately as I could "arrange them in chronological order, with indications of the manuscript collections or printed volumes in which they are to be found."

The absence of errors is particularly noticeable. The only real slip which we have detected is the statement that the Chancery offices, known as *the Six Clerks* (to the moiety of a reversion of one of which Wotton was appointed in 1611) were abolished in 1654 by

Cromwell. The ordinances of 1654, which lapsed in 1656, do not seem to have affected *the Six Clerks*, who were abolished in 1842.

THE MODERN CHURCH.*

Archdeacon Cheetham is to be heartily congratulated on the completion of his work, so long in hand, on the Christian Church since the Reformation. It is lucid and unbiassed, dignified in tone and learned in fact, while the sense of proportion is admirably preserved with respect to every period and every theme. It is eminently a book for the general library, a work of frequent reference, and may properly be used with the same author's History of the Early Church and Archdeacon Hardwick's Histories of the Middle Age and of the Reformation. These works, as Archdeacon Cheetham very justly points out, "form a complete History of the Christian Church, on a small scale indeed, but written with constant reference to the original authorities, and including, it is hoped, all the more important events and movements which have made the Church what it now is." Principal Lindsay's important volumes, equally condensed and equally lucid, on the History of the Reformation should, we think, find a place beside these works.

Archdeacon Cheetham divides his book into twelve chapters or parts, which, in a series of pictures, vivid in form and intimately related, bring the evolution of Christian doctrine and polity clearly before the student. The first chapter, entitled "Last struggles of the Reformation," is admirably done. We watch the fight for mastery between the Reformation and the Counter Reformation in France, Switzerland, Piedmont, Hungary, Transylvania, Poland; we hear the pother of the Thirty Years War, the marching and counter marching of Tilly and Wallenstein, Gustavus Adolphus and Oxenstierna, Turenne and Wrangel; we behold the desolation of Germany and the final failure there of the political Counter Reformation; we see the persecution of Protestants still afflicting Europe, and in France securing the Pyrrhic triumphs of Roman Catholicism. The seventeenth century struggle in England, Scotland and Ireland is described with particularity and ease. One minute point of fact may be questioned. The Nonjurors did not die out till the early years of the nineteenth century. The statement in the chapter on *Anglican Theology and Theologians*, that according to Hobbes "Religion and morality have thus no basis beyond the will of the supreme power in the State, whatever it may be," is open to more serious criticism. This is the popular view of Hobbes' position, but it is profoundly untrue and misleading.

The chapter on the Roman Church is strikingly written, and it may be said that here, as elsewhere through this work, Canon

* 'A History of the Christian Church since the Reformation,' by S. Cheetham D.D., Archdeacon and Canon of Rochester. (Messrs. Macmillan & Co. Price 10s. d.)

Cheetham is notably fair to the Roman Communion, though he dwells with perfect justice on the preposterous immobility of Rome in relation to the established conclusions of modern thought and general progress. The good work in far lands, as well as the profoundly evil influence in Europe, of the Jesuits is dwelt upon. He tells us that the Jesuit settlement of Paraguay "is probably the only instance in which European colonisation in America has made the native population better and happier." In his fourth chapter Archdeacon Cheetham deals fully and profoundly with the development of Protestantism. Perhaps it would have been wiser to connect Pietism with the ancient stock of German Mysticism. The relationship of Mediæval Mysticism and certain developments of the Reformation is still, apparently, not worked out, as indeed is the case with the relationship of the Mysticism of men like Richard of Hampole and Walter Hilton with the Lollard movement. This whole subject requires treatment which could hardly have been given in this book. Moreover, it must be admitted that the German Mysticism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had more in common with the ecstasy of Hampole than the interior revelation of Haemmerlein. But after all, the mystical side of the Reformation is not perhaps so important as the political and literary activities to which it gave rise. Literature and pure thought were handmaidens of the Reformation, watching over her cradle with Erasmus, repelling or convicting her enemies with Arnauld, creating a new epoch in textual criticism with Grotius and Wetstein. Had it not been for its humanising element the Reformation must have failed. Calvinism lacked the essential elements of life, and obscured both the humanity and the divinity of Christ. The Remonstrant controversy between Calvinism and Arminianism brought once more to the front the morality and the simplicity of Christianity, and indicated the existence of permanent elements in Protestantism, positive elements that are its life to-day over and above the negative reforming element of protest.

With the eighteenth century the Church entered into a new, indeed, into its modern phase. The English Freethinkers and Deists were forerunners, not only of the most speculative thought as to the mechanism of the universe on the Continent, and especially in France, but even of the critical movement that found its focus in the famous works of Strauss and the Tübingen School. The contest between Deism and the great Christian Apologists was not a more notable field of force than the Methodist and Evangelical movements, which aimed at giving new life to the Church in English-speaking lands, and not only rapidly achieved this object, but re-acted on the terrible social problems that were to be found at the opening of the nineteenth century. Side by side with these English forces came the philosophic and literary awakening of Germany, and Kant's

famous announcement of "Freedom, Immortality and God" as the objects of rational faith. This movement re-acted upon English thought and belief and played a part in the new liberalism of the English Church. It is not possible here to trace the great nineteenth century movements in the Church, but all (especially the Oxford movement) are considered here in sufficient detail, and without bias. The Church in America receives full consideration, while the chapter dealing with France and the Latin nations will be found fruitful reading. The struggle is now ended. "Thus the old Gallicanism, long declining, received its death-blow. The Pope is now free to rule the French clergy after his own devices, so far as he can enforce his decrees by purely spiritual penalties." The Protestant Church in France has, one may believe, a great future. The same may be said of Spain and Portugal. Archdeacon Cheetham is in error when he says that Protestantism has made but little progress in Portugal, and that "the Protestant congregations which exist are almost wholly composed of foreigners." There are many Portuguese Protestants in Oporto and elsewhere, while we believe that Congregational Protestantism is growing in Spain. The chapter dealing with the Churches in the Teutonic and Scandinavian nations in the nineteenth century is an admirable piece of work. Indeed, the whole volume merits this praise, for it brings before us the present state of Christendom throughout the world and the prospects of the future in such a way as to make innumerable complications intelligible and many current fears happily untenable.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMON SENSE.*

Mr. Frederic Harrison's striking and curious volume will be read with intense interest by many who are not professional philosophers, and with some chagrin by those who are. "For some sixty years," he writes, "I have studied competing systems of Philosophy, finding some truths and much verbiage in all. And long ago I came to see that philosophy, like Religion, is much more simple, more practical, closer to a strenuous life on earth, than philosophers are thought to admit." His protest against "the dangerous sophism . . . coming into fashion that religion is entirely a matter of feeling, not of understanding," will evoke a feeling of sympathy from those who have very little sympathy with the "dogmatic, coherent body of doctrine" that Mr. Harrison professes. He is certainly an impenitent Positivist who clings to the so-called religion of humanity with surprising pertinacity. He is a true Comtist, and prophesies freely as to the impossibility of progress in the direction of objective knowledge. The astounding revolution in the whole method of attack on the secrets of Nature mean nothing to him. He is prepared to argue now from the very

*"The Philosophy of Common Sense." By Frederic Harrison. (Messrs. Mac-Millan & Co. Price 7/6 net.)

premises from which he argued forty years ago, and to regard Nature as something that cannot be objectively considered. "We have really no ground whatever for believing that these our theories are the ultimate and real scheme on which an external world (if there be one) works, nor that the external world objectively possesses that organised order which we call science. . . . The dispersive, the analytic method of study, can never give us *knowledge*—for this is an organised order of ideas." He reprints his essays published in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1877, in the assured belief that they are as unassailable to-day as they seemed to him to be thirty years ago, and he still maintains the destruction of the personality by death. The fault of the Positivist is his Bourbon-like Positivism. M. Comte gave us a good example of the failing. He asserted shortly before his death that Astronomy had reached its farthest limits. It certainly at that date looked like a fact, and the founder of Positivism made an infallible pronouncement on the subject. The sequel was unfortunate. Within a few years spectroscopic analysis was introduced, and it was at once seen that the science of Astronomy had but begun. So it is with the great Apostle of Positivism. He has announced with Vatican authority that we shall never be able to peer into the secrets of Nature. Yet at the very time that the decree goes forth we are trembling on the very verge of discoveries* as to the origin of matter and its relation to what we call electricity that give us every reason to believe that the objective order of the universe must have a very real meaning for us. Mr. Harrison may be in a position to turn and rend the current philosophers who annoy him and most common-sense people, but his study of modern physical and biological science has not kept pace with his study of the neo-Hegelians. Moreover, his knowledge of the history of religious belief has many limitations. Despite Mr. Harrison's historical investigation we may venture still to assert the necessity to the human mind (whether Barbarian, Greek or British) of certain metaphysical problems. But, after all, what does it matter? Mr. Harrison's beliefs may count for very little, but his prose must count for very much. It is impossible to read his essays and not sorrow for the grievous fact that so great a stylist and so earnest a humanitarian should have devoted his genius to philosophy at all. He has given up to that vague thing, "Humanity," what was meant for mankind.

WIRELESS TELEPHONY.*

It is not possible in a non-technical review to notice in any technical fashion a work such as this, which deals in elaborate, though

* "Wireless Telephony in Theory and Practice," by Ernest Ruhmer: translated from the German by James Erskine-Murray, D.Sc. With an Appendix by the translator, and numerous illustrations. (Messrs. Crosby, Lockwood & Son, London. Price 10s. 6d.)

very lucid, fashion with the most advanced problems of applied electricity, and demands for adequate comprehension a full knowledge of the high mathematics of electricity as formulated by Clark Maxwell, Kelvin, and later workers. But, as a matter of contemporary thought, we must call the attention of English thinkers to this remarkable book, and to the astounding results already attained in the problem of voice communication over long distances. Of course, wireless telephony is our ordinary mode of communication with each other. "In the simplest case the air serves as carrier of the sound waves, while the voice of the speaker is the transmitter, and the ear of the hearer the receiver." The speaking trumpet, the "Whispering Gallery," are familiar instances of the extension of this method, while the air can be made still more effective as a transmitter of sound wave "if we use as sender and receiver instruments which magnify, by electrical means, the volume of sound transmitted and received." These comparatively simple methods will be readily distinguished from those (radiophony) by which speech is transmitted "by means of light and heat radiations." These are described at length here. The discovery of the "speaking arc" in 1898 by M. H. Th. Simon, with its development by Herr Ruhmer, is one of the miracles of modern science. M. Simon discovered that an electric arc might be made to serve as a telephonic receiver by the superposition of oscillatory secondary currents (produced by a microphone when spoken into) on the continuous current. The variations in the microphone current "cause corresponding variations in the amount of heat produced, according to Joule's law, in the arc; and these, in their turn, produce similar periodic changes in the volume of gases through which the arc is conducted. The arc, therefore, generates sound waves." The possibilities, however, of light (or heat) telephony seem at present limited, and immediately on Marconi's discoveries the electricians turned to an extension of his principles. It was hoped that it would be sufficient to substitute a microphone for the interrupter on the coil of the transmitting station, so that "on speaking into the microphone the current induced in the transformer would cause a spark at the spark-gap in the aerial, producing oscillatory currents which would transmit speech to a distance." But this did not give the rapid succession of sparks necessary for the higher overtones of the human voice, "by which the various vowels and consonants are distinguished." Three to four thousand or more sparks per second are necessary to obtain this pitch. You cannot diminish the spark length for this purpose, or the discharge will become an arc and inactive without oscillations. M. Q. Majorana succeeded in 1904 in obtaining an accelerated spark rate of over 10,000 per second, "by Lonardi's method of a variable spark-gap." This was followed by the use of what is known as the "singing arc," for the production of elec-

trical oscillatory currents. This at last made tuning easy and electric wave-telephony practicable. In 1906 arc generators were first used for the purpose of transmitters in electric wireless telegraphy, and now it is possible to speak across a distance of two hundred miles. Herr Rühmer does not expect any great extension at present of this distance on account of the "oscillations of small intensity that it is possible to produce by means of the human voice." On the other hand, Mr. W. E. Ayrtton thinks that the time will come when a man will be able to make his electrical voice heard all over the earth to one with a similarly tuned electrical ear. One trembles at the possibilities that lie before us as we get closer to the secrets of matter. It is not a question of want of faith to-day, but where faith will stop. If space may be annihilated, why not time, which is only a fraction of space?

PROFESSOR ELTON'S ESSAYS.*

Professor Elton is one of the few English critics who have acquired scholarship without losing sympathy. He has also another quality, equally rare, he gives the impression of positive force—not of mere negative analysis. He is an idealist in literature, and his ideal is a high one, he himself describes it as "The literature of hope, of faith, in the known life of man, and of a hard-won optimism." He finds it embodied in minds as divergent as those of Ibsen, Zola, and Meredith, and its foundation he bases upon science. "The spirit of science," he says, "is seen in the region of Art by a particular temper, by openness of vision, by the determination to exhibit reality. . . . That is the central current of the literature of our time." From this vantage ground he throws his search light upon many ages and movements, and his results are always vivid and interesting. His method is, perhaps, best exemplified in the lecture on Tennyson, from which the above extracts are taken. Tennyson, to Mr. Elton, lived "in a backwater, where only the fainter wash of the larger currents reached him." The critic recognises many of the poet's merits—the exquisitely sensitive vision which makes many of his lyrics like "soliloquies cried suddenly in the open air"; his mastery of certain phases of psychology, and his wonderful kinship with the Classical Renaissance; but, because he cannot trace in it the "Spirit of Science," Tennyson's work, in the mass, seems to him a ruin—"a kind of rich man's folly." It is not surprising that when he comes to deal with Shakespeare in his essay on "Recent Shakespearean Criticism," Mr. Elton finds himself at variance with those who, like Mr. Raleigh, believe that "there is no moral lesson to be read, except accidentally, in any of Shakespeare's tragedies." His criticism of this view only serves to show that he is

* "Modern Studies: Oliver Elton." (Edward Arnold, 1907. Price 7s. 6d.)

in reality in agreement with it, but the attitude is characteristic. He cannot bring himself to think of one whom he knows to be supremely great, falling short of his ideal. The result, in this particular instance, is that the essay in question is markedly less effective than most of the others in the volume. Here Mr. Elton is plainly working with tools that do not fit his purpose. In the pages on "The Meaning of Literary History" (a study of "literary cartography," to borrow a phrase of his own), on the other hand, the critic is much better inspired. The study is full of vivid description and illuminating thought, though one cannot always accept the writer's axioms: this, for instance: "Tendencies have no real existence except in the shapes in which the individual mind chooses to submit to them," is put too high; and, coming from one whose horizon is as wide as Mr. Elton's, gives an impression of inconsistency. The essay on George Meredith, too, is, as might be expected, one of the best in the volume, for Meredith is in many ways the embodiment of the writer's ideal. One may, perhaps, be allowed to found a criticism of Mr. Elton's work on the defect of that very quality which gives him his power, his devotion to his ideal. However much one may sympathise with it, one cannot help feeling that he is in danger of making it do duty for the whole critical pharmacopoeia. If we are to accept it as a universal test, we should like its value a little more definitely proved. One cannot read the pages on Shakespeare and Tennyson without feeling that the critic's sense of proportion is at times a little obscured; or the admirably effective attack on "Mysticism," without being conscious that he is relying on a dogma which he regards as irresistible. Very likely he is right, but a critic should deal delicately with dogma. The connection between ethics and art is sadly debatable ground, and Mr. Elton's dogma has a distinct smack of morality.

* * *

SIR GEORGE GREY.

This life of one who was not only a pioneer of Empire,* but a great Pro-Consul, is of much interest at this time, when so many of the problems which confronted him are now again before us. Born at Badajoz, in 1812, a few hours after his gallant father's death in the charge he led, Grey seemed destined for a life of struggle and action. At fourteen he went to Sandhurst, and in 1829 was gazetted to the 83rd Regiment and sent to Ireland. While in Ireland he formed strong opinions on the need of self-government and reform of land tenure, which were embodied in his colonial policy in after years. In 1837 he commanded two exploring expeditions to Australia, compiled a vocabulary of the aboriginal language, and prepared a scheme for the civilisation of the natives. In 1839 he married the

* "Sir George Grey, Pioneer of Empire in Southern Lands," by G. C. Henderson. (London: T. M. Dent & Co. 13s. net.)

daughter of Captain Sir Richard Spencer, and shortly after was appointed Administrator of South Australia. Almost bankrupt on his arrival, his wise financial policy retrieved the Colony, and the discovery of copper completed its recovery. In 1845 Grey was appointed Governor of New Zealand, and during this period some of his most brilliant work was done. In a life so full of action, and in such distant portions of the Globe, it is impossible to do more than touch upon the many great measures and on the mistakes of his grand career. Of these last, the weakening of the power of the chiefs without the substitution of competent authority, and the execution of Warcaitu, better known as Martin Luther, were the most serious. In 1854 Grey was appointed Governor of Cape Colony and High Commissioner of South Africa. Here he started schools and hospitals, which, with his firm maintenance of order, averted a threatened war. His splendid services in sending troops and money to India during the Mutiny was acknowledged in high terms by Lord Canning. In 1861 Grey was re-appointed to New Zealand, then in a distracted condition. The Maoris saw their numbers diminishing, those of the whites increasing, and a miserable war dragged on for nearly ten years. During this period the tension between Grey and the Home Government became intense, and the friction with his military advisors in New Zealand was an open scandal. In 1868 his tenure of office ended and he was never employed again. Unable to remain idle Sir George Grey returned to England, where he unsuccessfully contested Newark. He finally returned to New Zealand, where he had made an ideal home at Kowau, and there for three years he devoted himself to intellectual and scientific pursuits. He then re-entered public life, and was elected Premier of New Zealand in 1877. During this last period of his life plans were made and policy initiated, which were afterwards carried out by Mr. Seddon, who succeeded his "friend and chief." Sir George Grey's belief in government by ideas; in the education of the masses; of conquests, not only by military outposts but by schools and museums; his personal influence over the natives, and untiring efforts for their welfare, are truly stated to be among the brightest traditions of the British Empire. His South African policy of developing the resources of the country was followed by Sir Bartle Frere, Cecil Rhodes, and Lord Milner. Had he been allowed to carry out his scheme of federation there would probably have been no Boer War, and South Africa long ago would have been united under the British flag. That he was a difficult man to work with, that the Colonial Office found him insubordinate, is doubtless true, but these are, perhaps, inevitable blemishes in a character so strong and many-sided. The fact remains that the great prosperity of New Zealand and the present prospects of Australia are largely due to the wise policy and untiring labours of the great Pro-Consul.

JAMES THOMSON.*

Perhaps the greatest possible tribute to the genius of the author of "The Seasons" is that in the year 1907 an eminent student of English literature should devote a long and painstaking volume to poems which have been before the world for more than a century and a half. Yet it is difficult to account at first sight for Thomson's hold upon the popular fancy. There are many poets of all ages whose works are only read by students, but whose place in English literature is beyond doubt; while there are innumerable poets of varying degrees of magnitude who are not read at all. No doubt the survival of Thomson is the survival of fitness, but one is inclined to suspect that the incurable, perhaps happily incurable, sentimentalism of our robust race is partly responsible. Britons love the song "Rule Britannia," though not one in ten thousand knows that it was written by Thomson, and that poem is a characteristic example of his patriotism and his sentimentalism.

James Thomson was born on September 22 (n.s.), 1700, or thereabouts, at Ednam, in the county of Roxburgh, where his father was minister. On his mother's side he seems to have been connected with the ancient family of Home. Soon after his birth his father was called to the parish of Southdean, near the Cheviots, and at Jedburgh, in the partly ruined abbey, the boy was educated. Thence he passed to Edinburgh University, and there came under literary influence that had little of the artificiality that distinguished London at this date. He there acquired that love for the classics which never deserted him, and soon began poetry on his own account. Intended for the ministry, he nevertheless determined first to try his fortunes in London, and he arrived in the great city in February, 1725. From Edinburgh he brought a true love of Nature, and he was the representative of a school of thought that was turning from the artificial to the real in literature.

The literary society of Edinburgh was never of an exclusively urban character, and Scottish poetry had to a great extent retained that traditional feeling for external nature, which had appeared, for example, in Gavin Douglas, whose Prologues to the seventh and twelfth books of his translation of the *Æneid* had set an early example of the poetical treatment of the seasons. The youthful Thomson, full of the impressions made upon his susceptible nature by the scenery and surroundings of his home, found nothing in the literary fashions of Edinburgh to discourage him in his early attempts to describe the appearances of nature in his verse. Nor was he alone in attempting such themes. We have already seen that he acknowledged obligations to a poem on Winter by his friend Riccaltoun; and we find both Mallet and Armstrong employing their poetical powers in the same direction inde-

* "James Thomson." By G. C. Macaulay, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge "English Men of Letters Series" (Messrs. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., price 2s. net.)

pendently of Thomson and of one another. There seems, in fact, to have been a singular outburst of nature poetry in blank verse among Edinburgh students of this time; and though Thomson was the most eminently successful of the school, we cannot by any means say that he was the founder of it. Thomson ~~was~~ in some respects a highly original poet. He looked at Nature with his own eyes and not through the medium of books, and he combined a singular keenness and accuracy of observation with the imagination of an artist. At the same time he was dependent to a great extent upon literary models for the form of his expression; and the more so because the language which he used was for him a literary and not a vernacular form of speech.

Mr. Macaulay here seems to us to have summed up in terse and true fashion the forces at work in Thomson, the forces that made him a poet, the causes that excluded him from the first rank of poets. This volume traces in exact detail Thomson's life in London and elsewhere, and in cumulative fashion presents to us the atmosphere and environment that continually impressed itself on the poet's work from 1725 till his early and lamented death on August 27, 1748. He was as true a lover of Nature as Wordsworth himself, but his life in literary London, his association with political persons, his painful production of second-rate tragedies for the great actors and actresses then dominating the London theatre, his positive refusal to apply the lyrical gifts that he undoubtedly possessed to the themes that haunted his enthusiastic nature, his inability to free himself from classical traditions, all contributed to that "vicious style" which Wordsworth, not always just to Thomson, though he recognised his "high powers," denounced. Thomson's mistake was his belief that a poet could "return to Nature" while, in fact, his heart was in the coils of artificial life. The world was too much with the poet, and, much as he loved Nature, he never won her heart. Mr. Macaulay, in his quite admirable chapter on "Thomson and the Poetry of Nature," seems, at least to the present writer, to have missed this point. He regards the work of Thomson and Cowper as a stage that must be passed through before any poet can reach the higher ranges of poetic thought. "If we are ultimately to transcend 'the phenomena, and to realise the harmony between the aspects of 'external Nature and the Spiritual needs of Man, we must first pass 'through the stage of poetical observation.'" It is surely not a question of degree or stage at all. Neither the great poet nor the great physicist can stop at the stage of observation. The "ultimate 'synthesis," the "higher sense of spiritual harmony" must be reached by a great poet who loves Nature in her form and in her spirit, and to whom the artificial conventions of life and literature are things apart from the essence of poetry. Thomson's nobler genius was killed by his environment; how noble that genius was we may judge from works that are instinct with the love of Nature, and sometimes, in rare moments of inspiration, expose her inmost self.

Mr. Macaulay is to be congratulated on this work, which is a dignified and fitting memorial of a true poet, and makes clear many points upon which doubts have existed or upon which information has not hitherto been available, such as the production of the plays, Thomson's relations with Lyttelton, and the tenure of the poet's public appointments. It is curious that we should know more now about Thomson and his work than was known a hundred years ago. In the famous copyright case of *Millar v. Taylor* (reported in 4 Burrow's Reports 2,303) the jury found that "The Seasons" were first published at the beginning of 1727, and that Thomson died August 29, 1748. Mr. Macaulay shows that "Winter" first appeared in March, 1726, and that the poet died on August 27, 1748.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

"The Great Schism of the West," by Professor L. Salembier, despite the fact that it has passed into a second edition and is before us in an English dress (Kegan, Paul and Co., Ltd., Price 7s. 6d.), is not a work of any substantial historical merit. It is written with much earnestness and considerable charm, and exhibits a very wide range of scholarship, but the ultramontane bias of its author is carried to lengths that pass into the ludicrous. He declares, as a primary truth, that "the Church is a pure and absolute monarchy." That "primary truth" was not discovered until 1870. Other "primary truths" are no doubt in course of revelation. To attempt to explain away in a manner creditable to the Church of Rome the astounding series of events that culminated in the Council of Constance is an abuse of history. M. Salembier, in his Preface, pleads for honest history, and quotes the advice of Pope Leo XIII. "First let the historian say nothing false: next let him conceal nothing true." Yet this book succeeds in conveying an idea of the Great Schism that is a mere travesty of the real movement of events. The author is furious with the great doctors of Paris, such as the famous Gerson, who asserted that the Pope is subject to the General Council of the Church. Gallicanism is to him as wicked as Hussism. He is unfortunate, to say the least, in the Pope he defends. Benedict XIII. was a man of dignity and good character. But Cossa, the infamous John XXIII., is the rival favoured in this book. It is true that M. Salembier gently chides him for his only respectable vices—ambition and greed. He forgets, or denies, the irrefragable rest. The chronicler who attempts to whitewash this man can scarcely expect much sympathy from his readers, while the justification of the murder of Huss is an impertinence of the worst type. The history, in fact, is like a photographic negative. What will be white in the true historic picture is black; what will be black is white. Everything is transfigured, and we are asked to believe that all the great historians who have dealt with this period have been mistaken. Well, the truth is well known, and no book of this type will alter the verdict of posterity. It is the business of the Church of Rome to redeem its reputation, not to explain away its terrible record in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The new edition of Mr. Kipling's "Brushwood Boy" (Messrs. Macmillan & Co., price 6s.), admirably illustrated in colour by Mr. F. H. Townsend, will be welcomed by all who love that wonderful writer. It is a vivid story, and its weird interlacings of the actual life lived by a brilliant and conscientious officer in India, devoted beyond all things to making his little bit of the service absolutely efficient, with the dream life that was destined to come true, is described with extraordinary effect. His dreams from the earliest days had centred on a place in the Sussex downs, where "a pile of brushwood" was "stacked somewhere near a beach." Into this dream entered a little girl whom he as a little boy had met in real life, and from that time onward, through years at a public school and in the Army, the dream came back to him at frequent intervals, and he would find the brushwood pile and "The Thirty-mile Ride," and go wonderful journeys in search of someone over unknown seas and through unknown dimensions, meeting and evading fearful enemies. He got to know this dream world so well that in his waking hours he had the names and geography of it all clear and plain. Through it all there ranged this other figure, his little girl of childhood's days, seen only once and apparently lost for ever. Now so it happened that all those years this same little girl, both before and since that casual meeting, had gone through these same experiences, and the two in the spirit had been chasing each other over the eternal wilderness of uncreated but imagined things. The story has the most biting sense of reality. Mr. Kipling, with his extraordinary power of creating that sense, gives the reader the weird feeling—and perhaps it is the philosophic truth—that we are surrounded with a real world in which our spirits live, and that this hard world of ours is the dream, after all. Of course, the meeting of these two spirits in the flesh at the soldier's home in Devonshire is, despite all art, inevitably an anti-climax, though Mr. Kipling, by imitating in real life, as the two gallop together over the moors, the mystic "Thirty-mile Ride" of dreamland, and making the gallop the opportunity for recognition, succeeds better than appears possible to a critic. It is a wonderful little book and worthy of its author.

* * *

All who take an interest in the progress of modern scholarship will welcome the account of "The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1907" (John Murray, price 2s. 6d.), which Dr. Rouse has edited for the Council of the Classical Association. This venture was, it will be remembered, instituted and most favourably received last year. Its object is to present short and complete summaries by eminent hands of the year's achievement in the various departments of scholarship. The present volume is on the same lines as the last, except that chapters on "Hellenistic Greek" and "The New Testament" are substituted for those on "Comparative Philology" and "Private Antiquities." The change, at any rate with regard to the last-mentioned subject, is an improvement. It is important where so much material has to be dealt with in so small a space, to avoid reiteration, and Archæology is already very fully represented. Dr. Rouse's own article on "Classical Teaching in Schools," with which the book opens, is of great interest. It deals *inter alia* with the report of the important Committee of the Classical Association on the Curricula of Schools. From this and other sources quoted by Dr. Rouse one can discern a growing tendency towards the correlation of the dead languages with the living, the relegation of grammar to a secondary place, and the preference of oral methods of instruction and examination: the article gives a very useful list of new school books. The chapters on Excavations and Papyri are of the greatest interest, though of course there

is not much space for any summing up of results. Special attention may also be called to the account of the Ritual play seen in Thrace by Mr. R. M. Dawkins and already described by him in the *Hellenic Journal* for 1906.

* * *

Lord Dunraven's volume, entitled "The Outlook in Ireland: the Case for Devolution and Conciliation" (Mr. John Murray: Messrs. Hodges, Figgis & Co., Ltd., Dublin, price 7s. 6d. net), has been issued at a timely moment, and may be read with benefit by all classes of Irishmen and Englishmen. He tells us that "The burden of responsibility for the future of the country rests . . . less upon the Government and the people of Great Britain than upon the inhabitants of Ireland. By the exercise of self-control; by bearing in mind the legislative limitations of any Government in dealing with reform, and with all the phases of an intricate problem; by preserving the peaceful condition of the country, and refusing to lend themselves to any form of unconstitutional agitation, they can give the Government the powerful assistance which is essential for the successful fulfilment of the policy to which they are committed." From any point of view these are weighty words. Disturbances in Ireland only put back the clock and render any settlement impossible. Professional agitators, indeed, desire this. It is their trade, and peace is the last thing they want. "What can Ireland do? She can be conciliatory, willing to believe that justice will follow upon reasonable demands, and prosperity upon justice." All parties must desire such an end. But till a living educational system is created it will scarcely be possible. "No semblance of real co-ordination exists, with the result that in no other part of the British Empire is the machinery for education so ill-adjusted to the needs of the community and so barren in results." Lord Dunraven deals at length with the economic and industrial conditions of Ireland, and, as we have said, his plea for conciliation requires careful and honest consideration.

* * *

The second volume of M. André L. Simon's "History of the Wine Trade in England" (Wyman and Sons, London, price 5s. net), dealing with the progress of the trade during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, is not less valuable as a contribution to economic history than the first volume. M. Simon has dealt with his mediæval material elaborately and well, and has left no source unexamined. The Record Office has yielded much, while the detailed examination of the manuscript letter books in the Guildhall of the City of London has given many facts hitherto unknown. But M. Simon has gone to many other sources, such as the invaluable Reports of the Historical Manuscript Commission, "The Roll of Ancient English Cookery" (*circa* 1390), private journals of the Middle Ages, household regulations, and so forth. The letter books and other sources have yielded an appendix of curious interest—a list of London taverns from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. This list of considerably over a hundred mediæval inns is a valuable contribution to the social history of London. The Appendix giving the prices of wine in England during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is an elaborate piece of work. In the first quarter of the fifteenth century red wine could be bought for fourpence a gallon. A century later no wine could be obtained under eightpence a gallon except Rochelle wine, which was sold at fourpence in 1553. By the end of the sixteenth century prices had materially risen. The book gives a vivid picture of the conditions of trade before the time of the Tudors. The English Channel teemed with pirates and

privateers, and the wonder was that merchants were willing to put to sea at all. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the demand for wine was at its height, and the poorest peasant regarded a commodity that could be had at twopence a gallon as a necessity. At the close of the Middle Ages this general demand died away and more expensive wines, notably those from the Levant, such as Malvoisie, came into the market to meet the wants of a better class. M. Simon notes that Falstaff never could have drunk sack (or 'seck)—a dry amber wine from the South of Spain artificially sweetened to suit the English taste—as it was unknown in his day. It was generally drunk in Shakespeare's time and was, therefore, attributed to the table of the fifteenth century.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. T. Howard Moore's volume, entitled "The New Ethics" (London: Ernest Bell), is a protest against many social customs, practices and habits, and an appeal for progress in the social art of life. The chapter on "Our Four-footed Slaves" and "The Cost of a Skin" are protests against cruelty to animals. The obtaining of a fur for a lady no doubt often involves cruelty. Mr. Moore tells us that vegetable products can give us all that we now need from conscious creatures for dress. He naturally condemns the flesh-eater. "Man is 'a savage.'" From many points of view Mr. Moore is right, though we doubt if he will convert the world yet awhile. He does not expect to do so, but looks to the far future with hope. "It seems sometimes 'that I can almost see the shining spires of that Celestial Civilization 'that man is to build in the ages to come on this earth—that Civilization that will jewel the land masses of this planet in that sublime time 'when Science has wrought the miracles of a million years, and Man, 'no longer the savage he now is, breathes JUSTICE and BROTHERHOOD 'to every being that feels.'" It is not good English, but the aspiration is admirable. It has been breathed by every thinker for two thousand years and more. "The poet says, 'O, dear City of Cecrops!' Shall I not say, 'Dear City of God!'" Mr. Moore thinks like Aurelius but does not write so well.

"The Inner Man: Studies in Essential Bible Truth," by Allen B. Woodward (Kegan Paul & Co., 5s. net), is an attempt "to bring out, 'if possible, something of the more inward significance of Bible truth, 'to dwell especially upon the spiritual side which admittedly is its 'substance . . . to trace the progressive treatment of the various 'topics as presented in the Bible, and to outline the meaning and 'development displayed therein.'" On this basis we have seven papers dealing respectively with "The Things of the Spirit," "The Nature 'of Prayer," "Regeneration," "Knowledge and Truth," "Man's 'Atonement," "Imago Dei," "Prophecy and Mediation." It is not possible to accept all Mr. Woodward's views; he appears to regard God as the sole fact in the universe: "Spirit is . . . the source 'of life, and at the same time the one self-existent fact and substance 'thereof, while it would seem to include all real being as representation." This is obscure. The essay on the Nature of Prayer will well repay perusal: "Prayer, then, before all else, must involve an 'aspiration; its process is inseparable from purification of thought; 'and its efficacy consists in no small degree in the sure reward of this 'elevation."

The second (abridged) edition of the sermons of that eminent Unitarian minister, the Rev. John Hamilton Thom, entitled "A

"Spiritual Faith" (Philip Green, London, 2s. net), is issued to commemorate the centenary of Mr. Thom's birth. His life work was in Liverpool. As long ago as 1829 he was minister of the ancient chapel of Toxteth. Later he was called to the Renshaw Street Chapel. He worked in close touch with Dr. Martineau and made a deep impression on religious life in that centre of earnest Unitarianism, Liverpool. He died in 1894, but the vigour of his sermons has survived him. They may be read to-day with spiritual benefit and with pleasure, for the reader at once realises a literary gift of no mean order as well as an intense sense of reality. Many striking phrases occur page after page. "Laws are not *powers*," he writes in the sermon entitled "Prayer the Communion of the Holy Spirit," "but only modes of the action of God." The thought is wonderfully fruitful.

* * *

We must welcome the republication of "Frederick Temple: an Appreciation" (Messrs. Macmillan & Co., price 4s. net), by Archdeacon Sandford. It will be remembered that it formed the last section of the work, entitled "Memoirs of Archbishop Temple, by Seven Friends," published in February, 1906. It is now "thought that" many, who are not specially interested in educational controversy or "diocesan organisation, may be glad to have the more personal aspect presented to them in a volume which does not contain in addition a vast amount of matter which, important as it unquestionably is, has no direct interest in them." The biographical introduction by Mr. William Temple, son of the late Archbishop, is to some extent new, but is chiefly based on the earlier sections of the Memoir. We hope that this inexpensive volume will be widely read for we can imagine nothing that could have a more strengthening effect on the moral sinews of Englishmen and women than to read and appreciate the noble life and work of this great Englishman. Noble in thought and action, rugged in his resistance to evil, tender towards all that was true and honest, his life of untiring effort is an ensample towards which we must all look with pride and hope. The beautiful portrait of Dr. Temple and his mother is reproduced as a frontispiece and gives an insight into the essential tenderness of his nature, and of a mother's pride in such a son.

* * *

Mr. Peter Keary's volume, entitled "Do it Now" (C. Arthur Pearson, Ltd., price 1s.), is a rough and ready whip for the idle and the unready, and a somewhat rude stimulus to those who are really trying to realize their potential selves. Here are many original proverbs, some good and a good many very mediocre, but all with the same idea—the urging of men and women to do to-day the things that they would like to put off till to-morrow. Here are many stories of success due to energy, readiness, pertinacity, power, and willingness to work; here, too, are stories of failure, due to idleness, dilatoriness, unreadiness. There is very little room for the mystic in Mr. Keary's very material world, but there is plenty of room for thought and the carrying of thought into action. To be always ready is a useful philosophy, and here it is in its crudest form.

* * *

Mr. B. Stewart's volume, entitled "The Land of the Maple Leaf; or, Canada as I saw it" (Messrs. George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., price

6s.), is well illustrated by the author's own photographs—the photographs of American Indian baskets and ware are excellent—and is brightly written. We may not altogether agree with Mr. Stewart's opinions, but his comments are full of interest. He was struck with the Indians' love of their simple arts, and compares their beautiful work with the crude productions of the modern machine. We have a good deal to learn in the way of art from our subject races. The book should be read by all who propose to emigrate to Canada. Here he will find facts and truths that will help him in his search for a home and a livelihood somewhere between Montreal and the Rockies.

NOTES.

It is proposed to publish a permanent record of the remarkable Exhibition of the Order of the Golden Fleece held in Bruges during last summer. In a fine collection of works of art was illustrated the history of the Order, from its foundation, in 1429, by Philip Duke of Burgundy. At once the Order became a prized possession, and obtained a prominence which has been maintained, so that it is now one of the most coveted badges of honour. It is rarely granted to foreigners, partly on account of the rule which requires a special dispensation from the Pope to permit of its bestowal upon a non-Roman-Catholic. The only English possessor is the King. The Exhibition, therefore, was chiefly illustrative of Continental history, especially during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when the members of the Order formed a kind of Grand Council. Besides pictures, the Exhibition contained armoury, tapestries, sculpture, "stallplates" (to use a word connected with the Order of the Garter), and similar treasures. Much public spirit was displayed by owners (and in particular the King of Spain and the Emperor of Austria) in placing their property at the disposal of the promoters of the Exhibition. Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, who was President, has written a historical introduction to the volume, which will consist of a series of contributions elaborately illustrated, and descriptive of the different sections of the Exhibition, by eminent experts. Only a limited number of copies will be issued of the book, which in itself will be a work of art executed upon specially watermarked Dutch hand-made paper.

* * *

The large space which Congresses and Conferences occupy in the public life of the present day is remarkable. For months a notable gathering of some of the most distinguished diplomatists in the world was engaged in an endeavour to secure international peace. For a shorter period the problems of the British Empire received consideration at the Colonial Conference, while the deliberations of an especially convened assembly were devoted to the important subject of education. In the present year the Church, which has been the pioneer of sound government and the promoter of education wherever the English race is established, has called together for the first time an important Congress upon a similarly large scale. Last year when the American people celebrated the birth of the nation, their President and our King combined by their presents to Bruton Church to accentuate the remarkable

share which the Church of England took in the founding of the infant Commonwealth. This year, when representatives of all the churches in communion with the Church of England meet together to take counsel upon the difficult problems with which they are confronted, they will be joined by a large contingent from the United States.

* * *

The Pan-Anglican Congress is the name given to the meeting of delegates from every diocese in the Anglican Communion with their American brethren which will assemble in London in June next. But it is not a Congress which may be judged by the standards applicable to the Peace Conference at the Hague or the Colonial Conference at home. "It is," as the Bishop of Stepney has well said, "a great appeal to the spiritual imagination of the English Church to lift its eyes round about and see a vision of God's purpose for it, in the light of which it can understand the story of its past and brace itself for the tasks of the future." The remarkable Conference at Shanghai, of which particulars were given in the last number of this REVIEW, illustrated the readiness of workers in the mission field to compare experiences and deliberate as to the best means of advancing their common cause. The Pan-Anglican Congress is to be primarily of a missionary character—that is, its first thought will be the extension of Christ's kingdom into all the world. Therefore, the thank-offering of men and women, who are ready to go wherever they may be sent, will be the chief contribution of the Church of England. But those representatives from distant lands coming to their spiritual home cannot fail to bring new life, fresh hopes, greater aspirations into the thoughts and hearts of those who have prepared for their coming. That work is now in progress. Throughout the length and breadth of the country many are engaged in studying the manifold problems which will receive consideration, and by prayer are creating the atmosphere of expectancy, which, by the grace of God, may bring this work to good effect.

* * *

"The Travels and Surprising Adventures of Baron Munchausen" do not dull with time and the edition now edited with a useful preface dealing with the disputed question of authorship (Messrs. Greening & Co., by Mr. Henry Blanchamp, will doubtless find purchasers. It is curious that there should be any doubt as to the authorship of the book. The first edition (not now extant) appeared in 1785. It was re-issued the following year with additions from an Oxford press. In 1786 the German poet Bürger (author of *Lenore*) translated the fifth English edition into German, and the work became famous. In 1824 Bürger was attacked with respect to the story, and it was then stated that not Bürger but one Rudolf Erich Raspe was the author, and this statement has been accepted though the evidence for the fact is very inconclusive. Raspe was a German who fled from justice to England about 1775, and was befriended by Horace Walpole. He was certainly in England at the date of the first edition. He was a genius as well as an imposter, and was well known as any authority both upon gems and on metallurgy. He was for sometime an assay master in the famous Dolcoath mine in Cornwall. He died at Muckross in Ireland while holding a position in a mine sometime before the end of the century. His life is a curious compound of genius and crime, and his reputed contribution to literature will keep the memory of both alive.

Lovers of ancient London, who have deplored the failure of the efforts to preserve Crosby Hall, will have an opportunity to obtain a permanent memorial of the building executed by competent hands. Mr. W. D. Caroe, who stimulated the movement for the preservation of the fabric, has been assisted by Mr. Philip Norman in writing a descriptive monograph, which will be published under the auspices of the Committee for the Survey of the Memorials of Greater London. The objects of the Committee, whose work is comparatively unknown although it has been in existence for twelve years, are threefold: (1) The general survey of parishes on a systematic basis, (2) the issue of occasional monographs on the particularly important buildings, and (3) the co-operation with other societies in the attempt to save buildings of historical importance. A survey of the parish of Bromley-by-Bow has already been published, and it is hoped to issue a first part of a survey of Chelsea during the summer. More could be done if the Committee had a larger subscription list, but seven monographs have been published already, and others, besides Crosby Hall, are in an advanced state of preparation.

* * *

It is much to be hoped that the noble bequest, said to amount to £400,000, by the late Sir William Pearce to Trinity College, Cambridge, may stimulate others to show a similar generosity towards the educational needs of the country. In order to avoid any possibility of misapprehension, it may be mentioned that this money goes to the College, and not to the funds of the University. Cambridge, as well as Oxford, to which reference has been made in the last three numbers of this Review, has made an appeal to the nation. Englishmen have not yet learnt to give with the readiness of Americans towards the support of educational work. It may be recalled, however, that John Harvard, who set the example nearly three centuries ago by leaving half of his estate to the College now bearing his name, was a Southwark man, and derived his means from the success in trade of his relatives in this country. In this connection it is curious to note that among the bequests of last year was the residuary estate of Mr. A. H. Blount, a Herefordshire landowner, amounting to £80,000, left to Yale University, with which he was not known to have had any association. Less prosperous institutions in this country may be forgiven for quoting the hard saying which has also been applied to Sir William Pearce's bequest to the wealthiest of Cambridge Colleges—"To him that hath shall be given."

* * *

January 13th, 1907, is likely to be regarded as an important date in the history of aviation. That word, by the way, does not even appear in the Index to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, published in 1903, so rapid has been the progress in the art of aerial navigation. On that day Mr. Farman won the prize offered by MM. Henry Deutsch and Archdeacon for the successful accomplishment of the tests which were considered necessary to prove the conquest of the difficulties of navigation through the air. The conditions were that a machine heavier than air should travel at least one kilometre, and in the course make the circuit of a goal fixed at 500 mètres from the starting point. On the outward and return journeys the machine was required to pass between two posts separated by a space of 50 mètres. Mr. Farman completely fulfilled the requirements in 1 min. 28 sec.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. A NEW STAGE IN THE HOMERIC QUESTION	1
2. REVIEWS	6
LORD CROMER AND MODERN EGYPT. THE CITIES OF ST. PAUL.	
DR. RUSSELL WALLACE ON MARS. EDUCATION AND NATIONAL LIFE.	
THE AWAKENING OF CHINA. MARTIN LUTHER'S LETTERS.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS: Leaves from the Note Books of Lady Dorothy Nevill, etc.	20
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS	22
5. NOTES	23

A NEW STAGE IN THE HOMERIC QUESTION.*

EVER since Wolf in 1795 published his *Prolegomena to the Iliad*, ingenuity and erudition have waged ceaseless war about the Greek Epic, until one may say that the Homeric question has become the most enthralling and perplexing of literary problems. None, at any rate, has a greater subject, or presents issues at once so palpable and so elusive. For almost a century after Wolf constructive criticism was at a serious disadvantage. Practically nothing was known of the life and circumstances of the times in or about which the poems might be supposed to have been composed, except what could be gathered from the poems themselves. Now, however, the achievements of archæology in the Ægean give the critic some solidity of ground. No period revealed by excavation, it is true, gives the exact "archæological equation" (with respect, *exempli gratia*, to customs of burial, weapons, and methods of fighting) which the Homeric poems seem to postulate, but most of the features described in the poems find illustration in the remains of one period or another, and our knowledge is so rapidly increasing that one lives in constant hope of a solution being found. It cannot, however, be said that there is as yet much sign of an agreement between the parties. Mr. Lang, Mr. Ridgeway, and Mr. Allen, on the one side, and Mr. Leaf, with the bulk of the Germans, on the other, still seem irreconcilable.

The three books recently published by Mr. Lang, Mr. Gilbert Murray, and the late Professor Thomas Day Seymour, give an excellent summary of the conflicting theories as they now stand, and the subject matter with which they deal, and such a restatement is, in the light of new discoveries, very welcome. It will perhaps be well,

*"The Rise of the Greek Epic." Gilbert Murray. (Clarendon Press, 1907).

"Homer and his Age." Andrew Lang. (Longmans & Co.), price 12/6.

"Life in the Homeric Age." Thomas Day Seymour. (Macmillan & Co., 1907). Price 17/-.

before attempting any estimate of relative values, to see upon whom the onus of proof in this matter really lies. The advocate of unity, of course, points to his two well-worn volumes, "*Homeri Ilias*" and "*Homeri Odyssea*," and confidently awaits the onslaught. But is his position quite justifiable? The earliest references to Homer which have come down to us, those of Callinus, Simonides of Keos, and Pindar, attribute other poems to him besides the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and it is plain that early texts contained much that ours do not. Antiquity, indeed, would make him as busy a man as certain schools of criticism would make of Francis Bacon. To antiquity Homer seems to have connoted simply the bulk of the early Epic poetry. We know of no critic before Herodotus who attempted to confine his authorship to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, though this is the view that the opinion of succeeding generations (influenced possibly by the adoption of the two poems as the staple of education) accepted in the main, until the Alexandrian Separatists carried the higher criticism a step further, and began to encroach upon the sacred books themselves. Thus, it will be seen, the theory of Homer as the author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alone was a thing of slow growth, and was early subjected to attack. It seems then that the advocates of unity have a positive case to make no less than their opponents. They have, however, this advantage: that their hypothesis is an attractive and intelligible one, whereas it is difficult to set up against them any theory that does not puzzle and alienate the sympathies of the lover of poetry, whether specialist or layman. It was just the existence of this difficulty and the literary intuition that he brought to bear on the inconsistencies of Wolf, Helbig, Kirchoff, Leaf, and others, that made Mr. Lang's first book so effective. In his new volume he repeats his main positions, though he deals less with pure analysis, and more with evidence, and analogy, both archaeological and literary: and, indeed, those main positions are very difficult to get over. If, he says, you believe the poems are a medley of lays of different ages, how do you account for their general unity of style, story and subject matter; if the lays were worked up into a whole by a later poet, how is it possible, without attributing to him conscious archaism (a practice without analogy in saga literature), to account for the obvious antiquity and the more or less coherent nature of the civilisation they represent? If there were many poets of successive generations, or a college of poets, how did they manage to preserve the old manner, and how are we to account for the wonderful excellence of many parts of the poems which the higher criticism decides to be late interpolations? Further, he challenges any critic to attempt a stratification of the poems, according to dates, which cannot be proved to contain inconsistencies. Having, therefore, established that no critic has yet constructed a completely defensible theory, he proceeds to argue that the *Iliad* and

the *Odyssey* present a picture of a definite moment of culture. This he does by explaining away as much as he can of the alleged evidence of the co-existence in the poems of early and late customs, and by assuming a transition age between that of the Mycenaean Shaft graves and the Dipylon period to contain the irreducible residue. He confesses, however, that his "whole argument has no "archæological support," though so staunch an "evolutionist" as Professor Burrows has admitted that the evidences of transitional periods that recent excavations have produced "make it conceivable "that a given poet, living at the close of the Bronze Age, may have "had the exact archæological equations that are demanded by the "Homeric moment of culture, presented to . . . his individual "experience." Mr. Lang's final argument consists in an ingenious endeavour to prove that the "conditions under which the *Chansons de Geste* arose were truly parallel to those under which the Homeric "poems arose, and the poems are also true parallels, except in "genius. The French have no Homer . . . it follows that a "Homer was necessary to the evolution of the Greek Epics." Such an argument only needs stating to exhibit its incompleteness.

Mr. Lang shows throughout his old skill in emphasizing the inconsistencies of his opponents, and getting rid of not a few critic-begotten difficulties. The dilemma he propounds is not, however, quite a fair one. It is not true to say that there is no possible alternative to a single poet dressing an old story in the garb of his own time, and a later poet weaving together old lays, scrupulously archaïsing when he has to invent, but now and then lapsing into inexplicable anachronism. To state the position so narrowly is to show ignorance of what is really implied by the word "tradition"; but of that more hereafter.

As for the positive case that Mr. Lang tries to make for his single poet, the above rather bald sketch will show its limitations. He does not achieve anything very striking—moreover, there are some difficulties which he cannot get rid of, with which, indeed, he hardly attempts to deal. There is no need to go into any detail here, but one may refer to the proverb: *αἰὲς γὰρ ἐφάλατ' ἀνδρῶν σέληνος*, the question of the wall, Agamemnon's atonement, various inconsistencies in connection with the *Θουήξ*, the marriage of Alcinous and Arete, and so forth. If one considers these in conjunction with the nature of the Epic language, the use of ready-made and often inappropriate similes and other points in the general construction of the poems, it is difficult not to feel that there do remain difficulties which are inexplicable on the hypothesis of a single poet, and which require some theory of an evolution to make them intelligible. Of this view Mr. Murray is the latest apostle. He will only use the word "Homer" with an apology to designate "the men who were

"responsible for the main tone of the Iliad." Let us see what he is able to give us in Homer's place.

The merit of Mr. Murray's work lies not so much in the originality of his conclusions; he himself had already indicated his view in the first chapter of his "Ancient Greek Literature," Mr. Henry Browne, in his "Handbook of Homeric Study," followed suit, and Professor Burrows, in his "Discoveries in Crete," showed how recent events could be used in support of the evolution theory. The great achievement of the present volume is that it makes the theory a vital and organic thing.

Mr. Murray is well aware of the difficulties that confront an opponent of unity, and wisely prefaces his argument with an attempt to give a plausible picture of the way in which he conceives the poems to have reached their present form. He looks for the origin of the Greek Epic in the breaking up of the great prehistoric Empires by the gradual process of alien immigration and conquest, and the subsequent establishment, in the Dark Ages that succeeded, of the outpost civilisation of the "Polis." He then turns to the *λόγιοι ἄνθρωποι*, the wise men, whom he pictures with their disciples preserving and handing down the *logoi*, the written word which was their means of livelihood, by that simple but effective system of copyright, the ignorance of others. *Tradition*, in the strict sense of the word, was their chief aim; they did not aspire to write new lays—there was probably no demand for them—though now and then it might become necessary to join one fragment to another.

Throughout this early part of the book the author uses all his remarkable gifts of imagination and sympathy to make the story live and breathe, while at the same time he argues with a cunning admixture of logic that the unconscious inconsistencies with which the poems abound, the hints of alien and barbarous customs and moralities which later ages have tried to excise, the apparent transitions of custom, the evident sutures in the text, and so forth, are only consistent with an evolution such as he describes. He then proceeds to examine the historical content of the poems, and finds it mainly in the background. Here one may pause to indicate an error into which critics are now in danger of falling. Discoveries have done so much recently to corroborate the accuracy of the poems as delineators of a life and customs which really existed, that one is apt to assume that there is no description in them not based on actual observation. There is a tendency to attribute too little to fiction. Take, for instance, the question of Homeric food; one does not need the finds of cooking utensils at Knossus to convince one that the poems depict a "simple life" that never had any real existence; and other instances might be given. Mr. Murray does not perhaps lay quite enough stress on the existence of this force. A further foundation of fact is indicated

in an elaboration of Eric Bethe's view that much of the fighting before Troy is really a reminiscence of old tribal wars on the mainland of Greece, and that the tribes are now represented, not by the individual men who originally fought for them, but by their Tribal Gods. To this origin he attributes not only the battles of the great heroes, but even the shadowy conflicts of the *Androktasiai*. Lastly comes the question where, when, and why were these traditional lays actually crystallised into unity. Here the conclusion is that the occasion and impulse were the *Æolian* migrations into Asia, the scene Lesbos or some such meeting place of the two streams of emigrants from the Peloponnese and Thessaly. The federation of the tribes, which the migrations brought about, gave the Pan-Hellenic force and unity to the poems. They were afterwards gradually absorbed by the Ionian civilisation, and probably attained their final form at some of the great Pan-Ionian gatherings that must have preceded the *Panathenæa*.

In short, Mr. Murray's theory may be summed up as, first, tradition essentially conservative (not archaistic) but at the same time essentially living and progressive, and secondly, collection. His chief aim is to show how the impulse that lay behind the two tendencies may have arisen. Individual poets must, of course (as he recognises), have had a hand in the final unification, but the spirit of the poems is to him not that of an individual genius standing alone, or standing out among common men, it is "something greater and more august," the long cherished expression of a racial ideal. Indeed, Mr. Murray's theme throughout is as much the rise of the Greek ideal as that of the Greek Epic, and the way in which he correlates the history of the Epic as he conceives it, with the development and ultimate embodiment of the Greek spirit, adds much to the plausibility of his exposition.

Professor Seymour's work is on a very different plane. No resolute investigation of Homeric problems is essential to his purpose, for he aims only at producing a handbook, or illustrated catalogue of Homeric antiquities. None the less, he cannot avoid noticing in the course of the volume most of the difficulties which men like Murray, Reichel and Robert attack, and on which they found their inferences. He avowedly clings to the idea of a single poet, working, it is true, on traditional material, but depicting, in spite of much idealisation, the actual life of his own age. His actual treatment of the difficulties is, however, marked by a vagueness that makes them irritating and often misleading. The fact is that the issues of this problem are so pressing that even a catalogue cannot keep clear of them; it is driven to take one side or the other if it aspires to any exactitude. One cannot read Professor Seymour's treatment of any of the difficulties noted above without feeling this, and his embarrassment is especially noticeable when he has to deal with such general topics as the Homeric view of religion

or morality. He clearly finds a difficulty in placing the primitive barbarities of Achilles and the Palais Royal indiscretions of Olympus. None the less, his book, in spite of a lack of constructive ability, is a monument of learning, excellently arranged and illustrated, and should make an invaluable companion to more polemical works, such as those of Mr. Murray and Mr. Lang.

It has not been possible within the limits of this article to do more than indicate how the issue between the two schools now stands. It would, no doubt, be as easy to pick holes in Mr. Murray's work as it is difficult to give in a short space any idea of its merits. The very liveliness of his imagination is apt to beguile him into unwarrantable inferences, and the intensity with which he lives in the past makes one fear that the impression he gives of it may be somewhat unduly subjective. The fact remains that it is difficult to put down his book without the feeling that he has done what patient toil, such as Professor Seymour's, can never do, that he has shown that there may be an alternative to the great poet for whom Mr. Lang so ably and energetically struggles—an alternative more easy of acceptance, and even more stimulating to our sympathy and imagination.

C. T.

REVIEWS.

LORD CROMER AND MODERN EGYPT.*

It is impossible, within the limits of a brief notice, to do justice to Lord Cromer's account of his management of Egypt. It is a splendid history of a great administration: it is also an *apologia pro vita sua*. For modern Egypt is his work; and it is the model instance of the attempt of a dominating race to elevate a very backward country into civilisation. India is a vaster problem of the same class, and is yet, after a longer period, at an earlier stage.

The story carries us, with breathless interest, through all the dramatic scenes of the interference of France and England with the atrocious government of Ismail, the bombardment of Alexandria, the revolt of Arabi and Tel-el-Kebir, the rise of the Mahdi and collapse of the Soudan Government, General Gordon and the Nile Expedition, the Fall of Khartoum, and then, by slow stages, the training of Egypt, the recovery of the Soudan, and the beginnings of its education. It touches what is the most important question in general politics,—the uprush of nationalism. For Lord Cromer bears testimony to a real national sentiment, even in that very unheroic patriot, Arabi, and his followers; and he has much sympathy with the unhappy Dervishes in their courageous barbarism.

England was from first to last dragged into Egypt against her will. It was Gambetta who rushed Lord Granville into the joint note which led surely to the sending of the fleet and the bombardment of

* "Modern Egypt," by the Earl of Cromer. Macmillan & Co. 2 vols. 24s.

Alexandria. And, allowance being made for mistakes, which must always in great affairs be allowed for, the steps followed in regular order which make up the whole tragic and yet successful history. The most dramatic part of the story is, of course, the despatch, the failure, and the fate of General Gordon. On this great episode Lord Cromer gives us his deliberate and matured opinions. He holds that it was a mistake to send any British official to Khartoum, and that, in spite of many noble traits, General Gordon's erratic and bellicose character unfitted him for the mission with which he was entrusted. He holds also that if sent at all, he ought to have had an absolutely free hand, and, in particular, should have been allowed to employ Zobeir Pasha, for whom he pressed; but we should gather that he still holds, what he strongly held at the time—that the General was rightly forbidden by him to visit the Mahdi personally. It is certainly very doubtful whether either that plan or the use of Zobeir Pasha would have succeeded. Lord Cromer is severe upon the British Government for their long delay in despatching the Nile Expedition, and attributes it to Mr. Gladstone's unwillingness to face the facts of the situation. But he maintains that after all blame has been assigned, the Government were very unlucky, and is not disposed to criticise severely any of the chief actors.

We have not space to discuss here these knotty points, though we are not inclined to condemn the great reluctance of the British Government to attempt the government of north-east Africa. As in other cases, they were compelled, step by step, to undertake it, and their reluctance forbade them to take it in hand firmly or with adequate foresight. The British public cared little for Egypt and were only desirous of the impossible—to keep out of it themselves and keep out every one else. But they went mad over General Gordon, and seemed to suppose that the brutal Mahdi would also worship their hero. Through all those scenes of indecision and spasmodic enthusiasm, Lord Cromer moves with calm common-sense and a firm grasp of principle, financial and political. That path has led to success, so far, and the only hope of ultimate success lies in continuing it.

Lord Cromer gives us, in a series of chapters, a picture of Egypt as it stands to-day, and then asks what is to be its future. So far as it is possible to forecast, Egypt must either become autonomous or be incorporated in the British Empire. He prefers to move in the direction of autonomy. As an academic question, he is not and never has been in favour of the British occupation; and if our interest lies in evacuation, he thinks we need not stay merely because it is for the advantage of Egyptian reform that we should remain, unless the failure of such reform would cause serious political or financial complications. That depends on whether we could leave behind us a stable government, which would, broadly speaking, act on civilized lines. Oriental principles would inevitably tend to a new occupation

by some Power. Neutralization would be of no use, because intervention by some one would become necessary. International action fails to deal with misgovernment. A withdrawal from Egypt, as it now is, would lead to a complete upset; and the time is yet one or two generations off when the question of leaving the country to itself could be usefully discussed.

It is held by some—especially by Mr. Stead,* who was a chief actor in these matters—that Lord Cromer himself must bear a part of the blame for the failure of General Gordon, and of the relief expedition. Lord Cromer throughout his book shows himself ready to admit mistakes in this or that judgment at the time, and displays the modesty of the strong man. But it seems to us the more reasonable view that the true cause of that terrible disaster lay in the elements which govern English policy, and which create a doubt whether the British democracy are able to deal with difficult foreign affairs; and this is a lesson for the sake of which all our politicians should master this book.

THE CITIES OF ST. PAUL.*

This elaborate work deals at great length, and with a wealth of detail that is almost overwhelming, with the part played in the life-work of St. Paul by the geographical and racial environment of the man himself and of the stock from which he sprang. Sir William Ramsay does not exhaust the theme. He does not deal with the *Ægean* cities. A further volume, we must hope, will contain the material collected on this branch of the subject. Here we have a complete examination of the Pauline cities of Eastern Asia Minor, of Tarsus, Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra. Sir William Ramsay's object "is to understand the character of each as an experiment in the amalgamation of Asiatic and European in a social organism, and to appreciate the unity which runs through its history from century to century." The work opens with an introduction dealing with "Paulinism in the Græco-Roman world," and here Sir William Ramsay raises issues of the first philosophic and historical importance. He passes "under review the form which Paul gave to the ancient theory of the universal degeneration in history, and the cure which alone he judged sufficient to turn degeneration into progressive development." Paul arose in an age that saw around it the ruins of a great civilisation stretching back into pre-historic time, a civilisation wrecked by its inherent flaws, and finally destroyed by the aimless desecration of savage races. Who could look deep enough

* See an article by him in this issue of the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

† "The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought: the Cities of Eastern Asia Minor." By W. M. Ramsay, Kt., Hon. D.C.L., etc., Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen. Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. Price 12s.

into the backward and abyss of time to see the origin of that civilisation; who could explain its evolution or explain away its dissolution? Paul could not see back so far as we can, but with the subtle combination of Hebraic and Hellenistic elements in his nature he could grasp the saving soul of goodness in the things evil that surrounded him and indicate how that soul could be carried into a reconstruction of society. Sir William Ramsay, with great clearness and depth, dwells on the vital importance of the Hellenistic side of St. Paul's complex philosophic nature, and the final value of his book lies in the fact that by means of an elaborate analysis of the social life and growth of cities such as Tarsus, he makes plain enough the influence of Hellenic forces in the environment that made St. Paul in the truest sense a saviour of society. To him there was "nothing real except God, things are permanent and firm only as they partake of the Divine." This fact brings us face to face with the philosophy of history enunciated as Pauline by his latest interpreter.

His view, as set forth in Romans i, 19 ff., is that there existed in the world from the beginning a certain amount of real perception of and true knowledge of God and His nature and His relation to mankind. By observing, studying, and gradually understanding the facts and processes of the external world, men became aware of the power and divinity of God, which were manifested therein. But the deliberate action of man vitiated this fair beginning. The reason lay in idolatry. This cause obscures the first true and good ideas of men as to the nature of God.

Sir William Ramsay contrasts this view with "the fashionable modern scientific conception about the right method in the investigation of ancient religion." He repudiates that method while accepting the theory that there has been development. We cannot, he thinks, "arrange religions in a series from the lowest to the highest," and say that that represents an historical development. "The fetish, the totem, and the sacred animals, and so up step by step to Jehovah and the Ark of the Covenant. Is that the true line?" He sees in the modern savage not primitive religion, but the last stage of degeneration.

Who is right, Paul or the moderns? For my own part, I confess that my experience and reading show nothing to confirm the modern assumptions in religious history, and a great deal to confirm Paul. Wherever evidence exists, with the rarest exceptions, the history of religion among men is a history of degeneration; and the development of a few Western nations in invention and civilisation during recent centuries should not blind us to the fact that among the vast majority of the nations the history of manners and civilisation is a story of degeneration . . . The appeal must be to facts. Let us cast a glance back over Mediterranean history and the evolution and vicissitudes of its civilisation. On the Mediterranean lands and waters you have for thousands of years the centre of human civilisation and knowledge, and there best of all you can detect the principle of growth in human history.

Here we have an issue fairly joined, and we may frankly say that the facts do not seem to bear out the doctrine elaborated by Sir William Ramsay. That that doctrine is part of a great truth may, perhaps, be admitted, but it is hard to believe that on the whole, "the history of religion among men is a history of degeneration." We venture to assert that on the whole, despite, or, rather, as a result of, the vestiges of obsolete religions that cumber the shores of time, the history of religion is a history of progress, and that man through the long ages of his history has slowly evolved, as the beasts themselves have evolved from the lower to the higher type. It is true to declare with St. Paul that it is the hearing of the Divine Voice that has produced this result; but it is also true to declare with modern science that the spiritual ear of man has slowly accommodated itself to that Voice, that such accommodation is in itself the proof of continual progress, and that the apparent evidences of degeneration are, in fact, evidence that man has, stage by stage, rid himself of outworn appliances, grown old and corrupt in turn, by which he endeavoured to hear, and by which he became more capable of hearing the Divine Voice. We are perfectly ready to accept the appeal to facts. We maintain that on the whole, despite "the flux of mortal things," the peoples of the Mediterranean to-day, standing as they do amid the ruins of successive and marvellous civilizations, are nevertheless the inheritors of all that was spiritually noble and permanent in those civilizations, and that though they have neglected the means of agricultural and economic prosperity created for them by workers before the dawn of written history, and again offered them to-day by the processes of modern science, yet they have now a share in a spiritual faith and possibilities of spiritual evolution that none of their fathers possessed. And it must be remembered that many thinkers now hold that the people who dwelt in those ancient centres of civilization have not come from the ends of the earth, but are the descendants of the palæolithic man whose remains are found there to-day. Can it be said with any hope of serious belief that palæolithic man, in whose age the first glimmerings of art appeared, possessed the opportunities of any of his successors in the great area? On the whole there has been progress—at one time material progress—as in the pre-historic days, when the fruitless Mediterranean lands were made rich and fruitful; at another time artistic progress; at another political and literary progress; at another spiritual progress. But always there has been in the main and on the whole progress towards that far end which we cannot see. Degeneration is a dismal doctrine, and an unnecessary. If man *could* divorce himself from God, the doctrine no doubt would be true. But Meister Eckhardt declared the truth when he said that we must of necessity abide in God; if we fall out of the hands of His mercy, we fall into the hands of His justice. That has been the history of nations, and

that has secured for man progress on the whole, from the quaternary epoch even until now. Degeneration is another term for falling into the hands of God's justice. Sir William Ramsay admits this in much that he says, and if that is so, degeneration simply means that a new line of progress is being taken and the old abandoned.

We have ventured with great diffidence to join issue with this eminent scholar on this particular point, as we think that it is important to emphasise our belief that Progress and not Retrogression is the order of the life of man. But this does not blind us to the great value of this really wonderful book and the flood of light that it throws on the Hellenic element in the evolution of Christian thought and practice. The mass of learning here gathered together will enable future students and scholars to realise as never before the forces that went to make up that prodigious personality who yearly looms larger against the sky of time—Paul of Tarsus, the citizen of no mean city.

DR. RUSSELL WALLACE'S BOOK ON MARS.*

Not long ago there was occasion to mention in this REVIEW a book by Professor Percival Lowell on "Mars and its Canals," in which the author described the observations of the surface of the planet made at his observatory in Arizona, and deduced from them that the straight lines which have been somewhat injudiciously called "canals" and the oases which they joined are of artificial formation, and are the work of intelligent beings who inhabit the planet. The veteran philosopher, Dr. Russell Wallace, in the small book* now before us, seeks to controvert the conclusion in Prof. Lowell's work, which he considers to be a challenge to the thinking world. It has been urged against his conclusion that Professor Lowell established his observatory and set out on his research for the purpose of finding that there were inhabitants on Mars; similarly it is to be remembered that in a book written to prove that terrestrial man is at the centre of the universe, Dr. Wallace expressed the opinion that Mars is not inhabited, so that his consideration of the observation of evidence may not be wholly unbiased. Dr. Wallace does not deny or doubt the observations. He accepts the straight line markings as realities, putting aside the experiments which have been made to show that the appearance of straight lines would be produced equally well by discontinuous patches, and neglects the arguments that it is impossible to suppose all the lines seen really exist, because they would occupy a total area more than half that of the surface of the planet; but accepting the observations, Dr. Wallace seeks to controvert the astronomer's conclusions. Prof. Lowell says that these scoriation are not natural because there is nothing like them on any

* *Is Mars Habitable?* by ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE, F.R.S. (Macmillan & Co., London, 1907. Price 2s. 6d.)

other planet. Dr. Wallace points out some regions on the surface of the earth which might be seen as straight lines if looked at from an appropriate distance, and makes a suggestion as to the origin of Mars which would account for it being a structure full of cracks and fissures. This suggestion is derived from the development of Sir Norman Lockyer's meteoritic hypothesis called the *planetesimal* theory, the primary assumption of which is that the planets were formed by aggregations of meteorites, which were knots in a spiral nebula. Mars, lying between two larger planets, was formed by a comparatively small aggregation in the beginning, and the mutual impact of the particles did not produce much heat, and this being quickly radiated away, the planet was left a small cool mass. Afterwards, a larger swarm of meteors was captured, and Mars having acquired its present mass, consisted of a hot, plastic thin outer shell on a cold interior, and the cooling of the heated shell was therefore accompanied by the cleavages, which are the markings now seen.

This, of course, is only speculation, just as is the view of Prof. Lowell that the markings are the result of work of intelligent beings, but Dr. Wallace adduces cogent reasons why he thinks this last view to be untenable. The astronomer says they are water-courses, designed to carry the fluid produced by the melting of the polar snows to the equatorial regions to encourage vegetation necessary for the support of the inhabitants. The philosopher asserts that there is no water on the planet under consideration, and quotes Dr. Johnstone Stoney to the effect that aqueous vapour cannot permanently exist there, or on any planet, unless its mass is at least a quarter that of the earth, which is not the case with Mars. He also says that spectroscopic evidence quite negatives the view that water is present, but it is to be remarked that Prof. Lowell's assistant lately, and other spectroscopists previously, have found observational evidence of water in a slight degree. Further, Dr. Wallace asks the pertinent question: how could these hypothetical Martians have existed before this great system was made? If the difficulties of living were such that these irrigation works were necessary, how did the population manage to live, and increase, and rise to the high state of civilisation and knowledge necessary for their construction. But here he hardly seems to take Prof. Lowell's point. Prof. Lowell's somewhat romantic argument was that the water supply was not always insufficient but seeing it becoming so, these intelligent beings set themselves to work to make the most of their resources, and made the canal system as part of the struggle for existence. Mr. H. G. Wells has imagined inhabitants of Mars to whom eating in the ordinary sense of the word is not a necessity, and his romance suggests the thought that there may be sentient creatures who can live on a world without water, and at a temperature even as low as that which Dr. Wallace calculates must obtain on Mars, and which he says is quite incompatible with

the existence of animal life. We are still without an answer to the fascinating question of life in other worlds furnished by direct observation, and it must always be so. The answer can only depend on circumstantial evidence, and Dr. Wallace has certainly shown that this is not yet strong enough, although there are several points in which his arguments are open to criticism.

EDUCATION AND NATIONAL LIFE.*

Professor Sadler in editing this most important volume has done a work of the highest value for national education. Despite a century of effort our educational machinery is still unrelated in fundamental results to national life. On the mass of the population the school is not even yet a motive force for life. The average boy and girl do not acquire in school that reserve of moral and intellectual force, that power to direct latent energies in the most effective fashion, that realization of the nobler self lying hidden in every creature, which it is the function of education to create and reveal. Voluntary effort, aided by Governmental grants up to 1870, did much for England, but it could not cope with the educational destitution of the crowded areas. The Act of 1870 opened a new method of national effort, and when in 1876 the Legislature declared it to be the duty of the parent of *every* child to cause such child to receive efficient elementary instruction a new era seemed at hand. The meaning of elementary instruction has gradually risen, and to-day it involves a considerable measure of useful learning. But it is found that the age at which children leave learning is still too low. The Act of 1870 enabled thirteen years to be fixed as the age when the children could leave school altogether, while it allowed partial exemption after the age of *ten* for children whose parents wished them to go to work. Acts of 1893 and 1899 raised this lower limit for employment to twelve years, while, apart from questions of employment, an Act of 1900 enabled the local authority to make attendance compulsory up to the age of fourteen years. Where bye-laws to the effect are not in force children can still, under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, leave school at the thirteen age altogether, and become full-blown factory hands—"young persons" as they are euphemistically called. It is obvious that this system is open to every possible abuse. No educational system can be efficient as a national force if children of twelve can become "half-timers" and children of thirteen "full-timers." The minimum age must be raised. Professor Sadler has no doubt of this.

* "Continuation Schools in England and Elsewhere: their place in the Educational System of an Industrial and Commercial State" Edited by M. E. Sadler, M.A., Professor of the History and Administration of Education. Manchester: At the University Press.

In the course of every year more than half a million children in England and Wales leave the public elementary schools at thirteen or fourteen years of age. Not more than one out of every three of these children receives, in point of general or technical education, any further systematic care. Yet those who fail to receive such care are, broadly speaking, those who need the most. And the years which immediately follow the day school course are the critical years of adolescence when stimulating instruction, technical training and well-educated guidance in matters of conduct and personal hygiene are often most needed and, if wisely given, most helpful towards healthy living and self-control.

Instead of such guidance we use up our youth in parasitic industries, requiring for cheapness sake unskilled juvenile labour that leaves the child when he reaches adolescence without a trade, without an ambition, without, in fact, a social life at all. The great Government Departments foster the evil very seriously, for they call the best boys into their service for the post office, the arsenals, and other work, and, having used this cheap labour, throw them on to the unskilled adult market. That is monstrous, but there are signs that the evil is being recognised. How is this fundamental question of the further training of boys and girls who leave school at the most dangerous, the most impressionable, age of all to be answered? Are we to leave them to be moulded by their unnatural environment, plastic clay in the grasp of immoral, because unnatural, forces, or are we to extend the efforts of individual workers, of the churches, of local authorities, and of the State to give these children a real opportunity of realising their infinite potentialities for good. Here the whole question is discussed with an elaboration, an insistence on detail and a wisdom that mark this volume as the most important contribution to educational effort that has yet been made. All forces must combine and voluntary forces are perhaps the most valuable. The State must ever be the *dernier ressort*, but careful examination of all the data of the problem will show

in fair proportion the part which, in England, legislation can play in social improvements and the parts which must be borne by public opinion, by the action of employers, by the skill and good sense of the teachers, and by the personal effort of individuals who bring to social service a shrewd combination of sympathy and science.

The problem is well in hand on the Continent, especially in Germany. In Denmark the rural side of the problem has practically been solved for "about a quarter of all the men and women between 20 and 50 years of age now engaged in Danish agriculture have "passed through a People's High School." What can be done here in this side of the question even now is shown by the chapter (contributed by Professor Sadler and Miss Mary S. Beard) on "The

"Work of Continuation Schools in certain rural districts of England"—in Cambridgeshire, Gloucestershire, Northumberland, Cumberland, Buckinghamshire, and the East Riding of Yorkshire. The problem is to overcome the apathy of the young people towards a continuation of their education. "The earlier part of their further education must be sufficiently related to their outside interests to appeal to them as something of definite advantage; and this should be followed by work which in itself increases their wage-earning capacity." The teachers must have "a first-hand knowledge of rural conditions and needs." One may add that the children in the elementary schools should by means of school journeys and *out-door* classes be brought into living contact with the history and the economic possibilities of their district. The Evening School work in Cambridgeshire has as its most striking feature the Central Village Library of 6,000 volumes on Farming, Dairying, Live Stock, Poultry, Forestry, Horticulture, Natural and Domestic Science, and various handicrafts. These books, in boxes containing 50 volumes, are circulated from village to village and are of great educational value.

But the greater problem for the moment—though not ultimately, for the end in view must be to retain on the land a highly-trained yeomanry—is that of town continuation schools.

Everywhere the lines along which thought is moving point to three conclusions. First, there is the need for further limitations of the hours of juvenile labour. Secondly, the law should place all employers, including Government Departments, manufacturers, commercial firms, retail tradesmen, and employers of young domestic servants, under statutory obligation to enable young persons of less than 17 years of age who are in their employment, to attend courses of technical and general instruction for four hours a week at times of day when the pupils are not too tired to profit by the teaching. And, thirdly, increased efforts should be made by the State to encourage local authorities and associations in organising, according to the needs of different localities and of different callings, courses of instruction which will be practically useful to young people of from 14 to 17 years of age, and so planned as to train them for healthy living and for the duties of citizenship.

These are the ends to be aimed at, and all who wish to consider in detail the important data bearing upon these proposals should read this book, which traces the historical evolution of the Continuation School movement from 1780 when the Sunday School movement began to the present time, and describes at length the existing agencies that are at work. Here we may read at large of Sunday Schools, Adult Schools, and other educational opportunities for adults, such as Working Men's Colleges, Free Libraries, and the National Home Reading Union, the slow rise of the means for technical education, the growth of Evening Schools, the formation of Boys' and Girls' Brigades. Dr. Paton's work in the provision of social institutes, in

the formation of a link between the public schools and the public libraries by means of the National Home Reading Union, the founding of the Boys' League of Honour, the Guild of Courtesy, and the Boys' and Girls' Brigades, of the Recreative Evening Schools' Association, and of the Co-operative Holidays Association has been of immense value, and shows how much can be done by voluntary effort. The Church of England Men's Society is another agency that is creating new interests in the leisure of those who are beginning adult life.

It is not possible in a brief notice to touch upon the great number of subjects related to "Continuation" Education dealt with here. Professor Sadler carefully analyses the present position of State-aided evening schools and classes. The position is encouraging, but not without many weaknesses. At all cost we must avoid the German danger of "over-emphasis of technical training." The object of Continuation Schools is to develop the whole man. The special needs in the way of Evening Schools in special centres are fully dealt with by competent writers. Mr. Peter Sandiford's striking section on the "Half-Time System in the Textile Trades" is a document of the first importance, and dwells upon the awful evils of the half-time system. The foreign material relating to Continuation Schools is dealt with amply well and makes this work complete. That the efforts of Professor Sadler and his colleagues will give a vast stimulus to organised effort we cannot doubt, and we commend their work to all economic thinkers.

* * *

THE AWAKENING OF CHINA.*

The massive tome on the subject of the "Awakening of China," that Dr. Martin has compiled, need frighten no one who feels any real interest in the Far East. It is written with a light hand—its author is also a poet who not infrequently falls into genial verse—and at first hand. Few men know China better than Dr. Martin, and a more cheery well-informed guide it would be hard to find. It is fifty-eight years since he first began his life's work there, and he writes from an experience that is full and with an optimism that is contagious. He, like Sir Robert Hart, has successfully resisted the depression that the very vastness of China and her problems imposes on most men. To read and understand this volume is to obtain a very real knowledge of China, of its geography, its endless history, its infinite possibilities. With Dr. Martin we pass through "the Empire in outline" and see China Proper as it is, its myriads of toilsome people, its unequalled area of fruitfulness, where "the products of nature and of human industry vie with each other in

*"The Awakening of China," by W. A. P. Martin, D.D., LL.D., formerly President of the Chinese Imperial University. Illustrated from Photographs. (Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, Price 16s. net.)

"extent and variety." The eighteen provinces comprise a million and a half of square miles, sheltering four hundred millions of people, producing and using "the three staples of food and clothing"—wheat, rice and cotton; and the three staples of luxury and vice—silk, hemp and opium. The fact that this immense stagnant population is stirring, awakens thought, and the reader turns with interest to "the history in outline" of this ancient Empire, comprising not only China Proper, but those vast outlying regions, Manchuria, Mongolia, Turkestan and Tibet. Britain touches China in two places—in Tibet and in Upper Burma. The fact makes the student of affairs realise the vastness of this Empire of China.

Yet can she really waken; does not the opium of the centuries lie too heavily upon her? Time after time she has stirred since the semi-mythical period when Yao reigned more than four thousand years ago. The Empire was consolidating during the second millennium before Christ. In the next thousand years we find her passing through an acute feudal period, and we witness the destruction of that phase of social life by the famous Wen-Wang, who endeavoured to substitute communism in land. Those who are tracing the history of land tenure in Europe to-day have much to learn from the Chinese rule of the Nine Squares, eight subject to local use and the ninth belonging to the State. A new feudalism, however, sprang from the scheme. All this was before the age of Confucius and Mencius and Lao-tse, the Sages of China, who began to flourish five centuries before Christ. When Christianity was awakening in the West of Asia, in the East Buddhism arose to complete the faiths of the Empire of China. Ere the dark ages of Europe began China was passing through the struggles of imperial life. The feudal system disappeared. One Emperor of China arose in the person of Shi-hwang-ti, the builder of the eternal Wall, the coloniser of Japan. He died in the year 206 B.C. Next rose the House of Han—six-and-twenty rulers who extended the Empire beyond the Great Wall. Other dynasties followed, spasm after spasm. Invention intensified life within the Wall, and the conflicts of dynasties did not stop the progress of things involved in the invention of the pen, of paper (100 B.C.), of printing with movable type (in the tenth century of our era). At a very early date, the eighth century, Christianity was introduced into China by the Nestorians of Syria, and it lingered on for five centuries. Impulse after impulse, the impulses of war, of culture, of religion, of stern state-craft, of inspired song, have electrified this vast Empire and died away. New dynasties, epoch by epoch, came with new life and died away. The great Ming dynasty, which ruled the Empire from 1368 to 1644 A.D., was replaced by the present Ta-Ts'ing dynasty of Manchus, who flung themselves from Mukden on the rich prize. Yesterday the Russians would fain have followed their example, and

to-day the Japanese are sorely tempted. But Dr. Martin thinks that China is awakening to her own true self at last. She is learning the lesson that Japan has learnt. She is knitting together her disintegrated provinces with iron rails and electric voices; she is about to copy the representative institutions as well as the armies and navies of the West; she is welcoming true education and not despising or forgetting Christianity. Is she really about to awaken, to concentrate her personality, to "think true," to realise her force and expand her genius? If it is so the Western world will have to mend its ways, for the Chinaman is a much greater man than the Japanese. His is essentially a thinking race and it produces men of the first rank. What will happen if four hundred millions of men and women suddenly awake and find themselves an organised nation in possession of their form of the Christian faith and armed with all the sciences of the West. Certainly the balance of the world will be altered. The position is, indeed, almost unthinkable. But it will, at any rate, have one effect. It will check the decadence of Europe. If Europe is to survive in the face of the competition that such an awakening will evolve it must mend its ways, purify and intensify its faith, and cease from internecine war. A new Gentile world will have arisen, a Gentile world with at least as great a right to the privileges of Christianity as we have. The relationship of the West to that Eastern world will depend on the solidity of the West and its wisdom, and on the integrity of Russia.

MARTIN LUTHER'S LETTERS.*

A scholarly edition of Luther's correspondence in English is sadly wanted. A prolific letter writer who reveals his frank, tempestuous and deeply religious nature at every turn, who has nothing to conceal and the whole kingdom of God to reveal, it was seen even in Luther's lifetime that there was no better way of converting the world to Protestantism than by the publication of his letters. As early as the year 1520 publication began. The letter of September 6th, 1520, addressed to Pope Leo X. covering the *Tractatus de libertate Christiana* was published in the same year at Antwerp by Michael Hillenius. Seven years later the famous letter to King Henry VIII. of England, dated September 1st, 1520, was published by Peter Quentell, of Cologne. It was in the form of a book edited by Johann Cochlaeus, and containing Luther's letter, the King's reply, and Luther's criticism of the reply annotated by Cochlaeus. From that time onward Luther's letters poured from the press, and eventually great collections appeared containing over two thousand letters. De

* "The Letters of Martin Luther," selected and translated by Margaret A. Currie Messrs. Macmillan & Co. Price 12/- net.

Wette's collection of 1826 and Dr. Ender's *Correspondence* (the tenth volume of which appeared in 1903) are the chief sources to which the modern student turns. The correspondence is with all sorts and conditions of men, and reveals the great Reformer in all his moods and in all phases of his wonderful life. An English version would be of immense value at the present time when the forces that started the Reformation are being subjected to such full and elaborate examination. Miss Currie's volume does not, however, supply the demand. It is not entirely wanting in value, for the letters printed are well selected in so far as they exhibit the extraordinary range of Luther's correspondence, his activity of mind, his fearlessness, his wisdom, his freedom both from convention and cant. The letters, even as printed here, give the reader a vivid idea of the Augustinian monk who split the mediæval Church asunder and was the pioneer of modern Europe. In so far as Miss Currie has done this she has done useful work, but it would not be fair to the reading public to say more. Her versions of the letters are too often not even free translations and are less than just to the great Reformer. The style of the letters is Miss Currie's style and not that of Luther, while mistranslations are not wanting. We cannot complain of Miss Currie for entitling the Tract of 1520 *The Freedom of a Christian Man*, as this is commonly done by historians, but it may be pointed out that the title in the first edition is *de libertate Christiani* (not *Christiani*). We have carefully compared Miss Currie's translation of the letter to Henry VIII. with the first edition of that famous document. Her version is little better than a rough and careless abstract, so rough indeed as often to mislead the reader as to Luther's meaning. To translate *Cardinalis Eboracensis* (Luther referred to Wolsey Cardinal Archbishop of York) by *Cardinal of Eborack*, is, however, something other than carelessness. The Latin forms of salutation are also to Miss Currie apparently unknown. However, we have no wish to pursue these translations in an unkind spirit. They are disappointing, and are, we are afraid, only one more example of modern book-making. That the volume is full of interest and conveys an idea of Luther's untiring energy we gladly admit, though the fear of mistranslation haunts the reader on every page. The beautiful letter to his dying mother in 1531 (which recalls Dr. Johnson's not dissimilar letter) will be read with interest as a type of Luther's wonderful home letters. The head notes to the epistles are useful and carry the reader into the history of the period, while the prefatory account of Luther's friends, Melancthon, Spalatin, Jonas, Bugenhagen, Matthesius, Myconius, Von Amsdorf, Cruciger, and others is excellent. We suspect that the translations from the German are more reliable than those from the Latin, and this is a matter of importance. But the English edition of Luther's letters is still unwritten.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

"Leaves from the Note-books of Lady Dorothy Nevill," edited by Ralph Nevill (Messrs. Macmillan and Co., price 15s. net), the second selection from the note-books of the witty daughter of the Walpoles, is inevitably less brilliant than the first; but there is much in it to repay perusal. Many clever and witty sayings are recorded of men and matters down to our own day, and interesting comparisons made between the manners of early Victorian days, and those of our own, not always to the advantage of the former. Society at that time represented a small section, compared with the motley crowd who now claim to belong to "*le monde où l'on s'amuse*." The absolute brutality of some remarks, recorded by great ladies, give a curious idea of "*noblesse oblige*," as when old Lady Suffield, the "Double Dow," finding two sons of a wealthy miller and merchant in the county town assembly room, remarked loudly, "It is most unpleasant here, I can scarcely see across the room for the flour and dust!" or the entry in the visitors' book at Battle Abbey, where the hospitality of the Duke and Duchess of Cleveland left something to be desired, "From battle, murder and sudden death, good Lord, deliver us!" There are many interesting accounts of bric-à-brac, old needlework—even carpets were made by these ladies of olden days—and some very true criticisms on modern art, furniture, and the difference between real and copied Sheraton and Chippendale. A very painful account of the "hounding to death" of the miserable Madame du Barry by an Englishman named Grier, and her betrayal by the negro boy she had brought up and pampered, with some curious stories of the Dauphin's supposed escape, and several anecdotes of the great Napoleon, will be found interesting. Lady Dorothy's criticism on the ballet dancing of her day, when Taglioni and Cerito were models of graceful movement, is summed up in Taglioni's remark upon her successors "*Dieu, comme elles sont laides avec leurs indécentes*." As a collector, Lady Dorothy's tastes were somewhat catholic; plants, animals, curios of all sorts, rare and beautiful furniture, old brass and iron, even to the leg-iron of a man hung in chains, form part of her acquisitions. The influx of rich financiers, English and foreign, and the "grip of the city mania," as Lady Dorothy truly calls it, with the invasion of American heiresses, has naturally revolutionised society, and made wealth, rather than rank or talent, the universal goal. The disappearance of the professional talker may not be regretted, but the loss of conversation as a fine art is deplorable, and is probably one of the reasons of the bridge fever of to-day. An appendix, showing the correspondence between Sir Robert Walpole and the Pretender, is added to the Recollections, and contains some interesting suggestions as to diocesan councils and suffragan bishops, which might have been written to-day.

* * *

"The Queen of Letter Writers," by Janet Aldis (Methuen, London, 12s. 6d. net). It is impossible in a short notice to do more than touch upon the many scenes, and people, portrayed in this fascinating book. The authoress has given life-like pictures, both of Madame de Sévigné and her daughter Madame Grignan, who, with greater talent and beauty than her mother, entirely lacked the charm of that most loveable of women. The book is a very able presentment of Court life and society in France, and of the stormy doings of the Fronde, in the days of the "*Roi Soleil*." The period is the most brilliant in French history, between the rudeness of the days of Henri Quatre on one hand, and the horrors of the Revolution on the other. The splendid salon of the Marquise de Rambouillet (whose own life was a romance), where all that was great and noble in the world of letters, politics, and society was to be found, was a valuable education to the beautiful Marie de

Chantal, fresh from the woods where her uncle, the Abbé de Livry, the "bien bon" of the Letters, had brought her up. To his care and wise counsels she owed the high principle and force of character, which enabled her to withstand the corruption of Court life; and to his able administration, the large fortune she possessed on her marriage to the Marquis de Sevigné. Those were the days of Bossuet, Racine, Molière and Descartes, of Condé and Turenne, and the long tragi-comedy of "La Grande Mademoiselle." The sketches of the worthy de Coulanges, and the Blessed Chantal, grandparents of Mme. de Sevigné, are delightful, as also those of her girlhood at Livry, and, after her marriage, of her loved Breton home of Les Rochers. The illustrations throughout are excellent.

"The Letters of Edward Lear:" Edited by Lady Strachey (Fisher Unwin). That these letters by the author of the "Book of Nonsense Rhymes" are of sufficient interest to the general public to warrant their publication may be freely asserted, and certain it is that the correspondence gave great pleasure at the time that it was written to the friend to whom it was addressed. That friend was Chichester Fortescue, afterwards Lord Carlingford, whose acquaintance Lear made during a visit to Rome in 1845. Lear was then thirty-three and Fortescue only twenty-two. Notwithstanding this difference of years, the acquaintance ripened rapidly into a friendship which lasted till Lear's death in 1888. It is regrettable that so few of Chichester Fortescue's letters are given in this volume. His was a noble personality, and the few letters that are printed make the reader wish for more. Lear's letters abound in humour, and always good humour. They are full with it to the brim and running over. But his "sin-cerest laughter with some pain is fraught." Be the fun ever so frolicsome there is an undertone of disappointment throughout the letters, and one feels the incompleteness of a lonely life. Work, work from early to late with pencil or pen was his daily round, whether at home or abroad. But the bitterness of solitary toil was sweetened by these letters to his friend. The writing of them, with their quaint humours and rare illustrations, must have been to him a great relaxation; and through the medium of the letters the reader gets to know and love the man and the artist. In addition to the letters, we have given here, by Mr. Henry Strachey, a fair and true appreciation of Lear's artistic work, which will be welcomed by those who are fortunate enough to possess any of his pictures. The whole volume is of real interest, for it reveals the tenderness of a true friendship, and shows us two human personalities talking, as it were, in "asides" from their daily work. What the letters say may have no very general historical or social interest, but they reveal the character of the writer and of the first reader. A great novelist can do no more.

"The Old Silver Sacramental Vessels of Foreign Protestant Churches in England," by E. Alfred Jones (Messrs. J. M. Dent and Co., price 21s. net), would seem to be the first published account "of the historical relics, and especially the old sacramental plate, belonging to the various foreign Protestant communities which have founded churches for their own use in this country since the great influx of refugees in the reign of Edward VI." The earliest silver vessels noted are beakers of the third quarter of the sixteenth century, which formerly belonged to the defunct Dutch Church at Norwich, and are now in the possession of the Misses Colman of that town. Mr. Jones points out that the aim of "this purely domestic drinking cup" for sacramental purposes was to distinguish it from the "superstitious" chalice of the Mass. The Old Independent Chapel at Great Yarmouth still possesses one beaker of the same period and four Commonwealth

beakers. Many seventeenth century beakers are to be found in the Isle of Man. Mr. Jones notices that the beaker, as a Communion cup, was introduced into the north-east of Scotland by traders: It only occurs in one instance (Biggar) south of the Tay. It also found its way to Massachusetts. There is one beaker dated 1672 in the First Church at Dorchester in that State. The four silver beakers dated 1669-1670 at the Dutch Church, Austin-Friars, are of considerable interest. The Elizabethan beakers formerly at All Hallows the Great, Thames Street, are now at the French Hospital, Victoria Park. They were given, on the closing of the church, in view of the fact that foreign (chiefly French) Protestant merchants had worshipped there. Of course, many of the old vessels are lost. Those belonging to the Danish and Norwegian Church cannot be traced, while the vessels in the Swedish Church (Prince's Square), where the father of Emanuel Swedenborg was minister, were long since stolen. It is interesting to note in connection with this church that the body of Swedenborg is about to be translated to Sweden. Among the lost vessels we suppose must be included those in use at the chapel in London Street, Greenwich, where a large body of French Protestants used to meet after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Has Mr. Jones made any enquiries in Greenwich for such vessels? The chapel was pulled down about 1870. This book is most admirably illustrated, and will be the standard work on a fascinating subject.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

"Common-Sense in Religion," by Martin R. Smith (Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co., price 2s. net), is a little volume of "Convictions" founded, we are told, "upon common-sense, which assures me that many of the doctrines of the Christian Church are necessarily false, as they are in clear negation of the love and justice of God, and of his universal Fatherhood." Mr. Smith is at one with the teachings of revealed religion "as expounded by the Christian Church" on the ground that "future existence awaits us after our call from earth-life," but he cannot accept the Christian "Heaven," and repudiates what he calls the Christian dogma of eternal punishment. Mr. Smith also concludes by means of the *open sesame* which he applies to all problems, Common-Sense, that Jesus is man and not God. Those who are interested in the Religion of Common Sense may be induced to read Mr. Smith's book, which is a modification of what we may call orthodox Unitarianism. *Faith in the Fatherhood and Love of God* is said to be the sole article in Mr. Smith's creed. But what is Common Sense? * * *

We must call attention to the third edition of Mr. Thomas Kirkup's volume, entitled "An Inquiry into Socialism" (Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., price 4s. 6d. net), which was first issued in 1887. The work is of value, though it is difficult to discuss a subject upon which there is no agreed definition. To Mr. Kirkup "Socialism has no necessary connection with materialism or with theories subversive of religion, marriage, and the family Socialism is a new type of economic organisation. It means that industry should be carried on by associated workers, using a joint capital with a view to an equitable system of distribution. This economic organisation is naturally correlated to democracy in politics and to altruism in ethics." Many persons will be glad to read of socialism from this limited point of view. No doubt there will be some social extension in the direction indicated by Mr. Kirkup, but how far it will go is a question of narrow limits. That it will ever reach the stage of community of goods and the extinction of private property is out of all question, for to do so would involve the extinction of that sense of property that is co-extensive with personality.

NOTES.

The noblest work of women is done without ostentation, so that oftentimes it is inevitable, though not perhaps desirable, that it passes without recognition. None of the ancient orders of honour are open to women, with the single exception that by special decree the Queen is Lady of the Garter. At the end of last year the recently constituted Order of Merit was extended to receive Miss Florence Nightingale. It was no doubt the lack of any such decoration which led Queen Victoria to give her upon her return from the Crimea a badge bearing a St. George's Cross in red enamel and the Royal cypher surmounted by a crown in diamonds. The inscription, "Blessed are the Merciful," encircled the badge, which also bore the word "Crimea." On March 16th ulto. the Corporation of London conferred upon Miss Nightingale the honorary freedom of the City, which had previously been received by only one lady—the late Baroness Burdett-Coutts. Unfortunately Miss Nightingale's advanced years did not allow the presentation to be made to her in person. For the elaborate gold casket which usually holds the deed was substituted, at her request, a cheque to be devoted to a charitable purpose. The record of the work in the care of the sick at home and on the battlefield, which has been built upon the foundation of self-sacrifice and skilled devotion provided by her career, furnishes one of the most magnificent chapters in the history of the nineteenth century. The anagram on her name "Flit on Cheering "Angel" is an epigram that most aptly reveals her wonderful work.

Among the most valuable series of State papers issued under the direction of the Keeper of the Public Records are the "Acts of the Privy Council." Since 1888 thirty-two volumes have been edited by Mr. J. R. Dasent, bringing the series, which had already dealt with the period 1386-7 to 1542, but had been discontinued for fifty years, from 1542 down to the end of the reign of Elizabeth. The Treasury have decided that the work shall be discontinued, and naturally the suggestion has been made that they should be asked to reconsider the decision. There was much of interest and value in the proceedings of the Privy Council until the growth of the Cabinet system rendered their proceedings more or less formal. That period is not reached until after the Revolution, and it is urged that the series should be continued so as to cover the reigns of the Stuarts. Sympathy may be felt with the efforts of the Treasury to practise real economy, but there is some justification for the accusation that this decision is parsimonious in the extreme, and a deliberate reversal of the enlightened policy that has hitherto distinguished the relationship of the Treasury and the Record Office. The saving will be minute, while the throw-back in historical research and the discouragement of workers will be very marked.

It is tedious work to search and calendar ancient records, but an occasional discovery of real value is an encouragement which stimulates other works in the same field. *The Guardian* records that the Rev. J. Harvey Bloom, while working in the muniment room of the Dean and Chapter of Rochester, has discovered several fine Royal Charters and also the original foundation Charter of the Cathedral, that of the famous Gundulf, architect and Bishop, who died in 1108. One document has attached an extremely fine set of seals. It is the deed of exchange between Hubert de Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Gilbert, Bishop of Rochester, of the Manors of Lambeth and Darenth. If the Canterbury and York Society were supported more widely it

would be in a position to publish the calendar, which has been prepared, of these documents. It has in hand, however, a volume of the Episcopal Registers of Hamo of Rochester, 1319—1352. The Rev. J. Harvey Bloom has also completed a calendar of the more important documents in the possession of the Dean and Chapter of Worcester.

A recent disgraceful incident in the Law Courts has raised questions as to the disciplinary power of the Benchers of the four Inns of Courts. What is the foundation of this authority? An answer to the question is afforded by Mr. C. E. A. Bedwell, Sub-Librarian to the Hon. Society of the Middle Temple, in the March number of *School*. In their origin the Inns of Court were guilds of masters possessing the characteristics of a guild just as they were to be found in the University. Further, no one could practice in the Courts without the degree obtained from them. Therein lay the means of punishment, for any offence against the rules and regulations laid down by the Masters could be visited by suspension or expulsion, involving the withdrawal of the right of audience. They still possess that power, which is exercised with judicial discretion upon rare occasions.

There are few more fascinating subjects than the study of local history. Even the dull spots of the metropolis will furnish some reward under sympathetic treatment. Take, for example, the Walworth Road. The names of the streets running from it to St. Peter's Church provide a clue to the date of their erection. The neighbourhood around Walworth Common was built over at the beginning of last century, and the builder's lease from the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury required him to cover the ground with houses as speedily as possible. Moreover, if the accumulation of facts relating to the history of the past leads to a careful study with a view to obtaining guidance for the future, then the large amount of attention which is now being given to the record of London's history may be of real practical value. In addition to monographs upon separate places, such as "Hyde Park: Its History and Romance," announcements are made of larger works. To the "Memorials of the Counties of England" are to be added two volumes dealing chiefly with the City of London. The general editor of the series, the Rev. P. H. Ditchfield, is giving his personal attention to these two, for which he has secured a strong corps of contributors. The Oxford University Press announce a new edition of "Stowe's Survey"—a charming work, which has been the foundation for the investigations of modern historians. The editor is Mr. C. L. Kingsford. But premier place must needs be given to the four volumes which are to be a special item in the "Victoria History of the Counties of England." It is hoped that the first of them may be ready for issue within a short time.

Mr. Morley, in his "Life of Gladstone," particularly refrained from making any attempt to write a detailed history of him as theologian and churchman. That difficult task has now been entrusted to Mr. D. C. Lathbury. The work will consist primarily of a selection of his letters and papers on ecclesiastical and theological affairs, but its title—the "Religious Life of William Ewart Gladstone"—suggests a somewhat wider scope. The faithful presentment of that side of the career of the great Christian who, amid all the changes and chances of this mortal life, strenuously endeavoured to find the right path and walk in it, is a piece of work sufficiently exacting to demand the greatest powers of the most competent writer.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. SHAKESPEARE AND THE LIFE TO COME. By "MUSEUS" ...	1
2. POEM: WATCHERS AT THE SEPULCHRE	6
3. REVIEWS	8
PHILOLOGY OF THE GREEK BIBLE. THE OXFORD BOOK OF	
FRENCH VERSE. THE HISTORY OF THE WEST.	
THE ECONOMICS OF POVERTY. EVOLUTION OF TRAGEDY.	
IN MEMORIAM.	
4. SHORTER REVIEWS: Zoological Papers of the late Mr. John Samuel	
Budgett, etc.	21

SHAKESPEARE AND THE LIFE TO COME.

ALL attempts to attach to Shakespeare the label of this or that denomination or form of faith within, or without, the Christian Communion have, in a certain sense, failed. It was not his business, we may even say it was not his policy—for policy in religion was a matter of some importance in the reign of Elizabeth—to declare his religious beliefs. In so far as he was a private individual his faith was his own business, while in so far as he was a dramatist his declarations of faith were part of his art. However, it is true enough to say that the form and fashion of the old faith fascinated his nature in a way that was impossible with the reformed religion. When we read the plays it is impossible to believe that the age of the Reformation has come and gone. The faith of the Middle Ages inspires and pervades the plays to an extent and in a fashion that is due to deliberate preference. The formulas of Holy Church, oaths and phrases drawn from the creeds and gospels, are ever on the lips of his people. He shows a minute and intimate knowledge of the highly technical precepts of the old faith. No detail is wanting of Church life, from the carrying of the "chrisom child" to "the bringing home of bell and burial." Holy Church environed the creations of Shakespeare from the cradle to the grave. The Catholic position was, in fact, his position, though there is evidence that he did not recognise the Papal authority. What then, we may ask, did he think of that vital question of all religion—the life to come? Can we gather from the *obiter dicta*, or from the inner philosophy of the greatest of all dramatists, of the keenest observer of mankind that has ever recorded his impressions, any statement of his faith in the life beyond the grave?

The introductory paragraph of Shakespeare's will seems to give us a direct statement of his belief: "I commend my soul unto the hands of God my Creator, hoping and assuredly believing, through

"the only merits of Jesus Christ my Saviour, to be made partaker of life everlasting." How does this noble commendation tally with the faith that peers through the plays as we watch Shakespeare's great creatures live and move and have their wondrous being? The plays taken as a whole give the reader certain definite impressions. We notice, for instance, a profound reticence on great religious issues that are perfectly consistent with, indeed follows directly from, his Catholic position, and is not betrayed by his lavish use of religious material. The use of religious forms, he realised, is a fundamental fact in the lives of men and women. Therefore, the formalism of religion permeates play after play. It is part of the life of his age and is, therefore, part of the world that he creates. But the fundamental issues of which religion in fact treats are not brought into the foreground. One instance of Shakespeare's reticence and his reverence for the old Church is the fact that he never attacks the clergy or religious of that church, while he is always ready to smile at the Puritans. The stage, moreover, is not the place either for religious polemics or for the treatment of sacred themes. Neither the Mystery Play nor the Moral Play come within Shakespeare's vast range of creation, and this must have been the result of deliberate choice. Shakespeare could have written another "Everyman" had he chosen; but he did not choose. "The play's the thing wherewith to touch the conscience of the king." Man as he is, not as he is to be, was the theme of the dramatist. Moreover, as an "Old Catholic," he could not well place upon the stage the essential mysteries of his faith.

But, nevertheless, the Master of Tragedy could not but touch continually the problem of what follows this fretful feverish life. The Duke's words to Isabella, on her brother's supposed death, seem to show a definite conception of the life to come—

"but peace be with him!

That life is better life, past fearing death,
Than that which lives to fear: make it your comfort,
So happy is your brother."

It is interesting to compare this with the Duke's speech to the recalcitrant Barnardine:—

"Sirrah, thou art said to have a stubborn soul,
That apprehends no farther than this world,
And squar'st thy life according. Thou'rt condemned;
But, for those earthly faults, I quit them all,
And pray thee take this mercy to provide
For better times to come. Friar, advise him."

To the Duke, at any rate, the future life had a definite meaning even for Barnardine—the unrepentant thief so near his cross. If we turn from the Duke to Macbeth we come not so much to a

certain belief in, as to a certain heedlessness of the life to come. The realised fact of the future life is the same; it is the attitude towards it only that is different, the state of mind by which Shakespeare so subtly indicates the moral meaning of his characters. Take the opening speech of the seventh scene of the first act:—

- “If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well
It were done quickly; if the assassination
Could trammel up the consequence, and catch
With his surcease success; that but this blow
Might be the be-all and the end-all here,
But here, upon this bank and shoal of time,
We'd jump the life to come. But in these cases
We still have judgment here.”

If the killing of Duncan could end the matter here, “but here,” then Macbeth would risk the penalty of “the life to come.” Macbeth waves the future aside, eaten up though he is with superstition. For the moment it is the politics of the hour with which he grapples. He almost cries with Autolycus, “Beating and hanging are terrors to me: for the life to come I sleep out the thought of it.”

It is but rarely that Shakespeare comes to close quarters with the mystery of the life after death, though he does not hesitate to use freely the whole machinery of spirits, apparitions, and unearthly visitants. The matter is too sacred, too far-reaching for the playhouse. Shakespeare never forgot that he was primarily, so far as his own age went, a play-wright. But in *Hamlet* he touches both the fact and the philosophy of the subject. He deliberately gives a verisimilitude to the appearance of the ghost with the cry—

“There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.”

Hamlet's philosophy is a more complex business:—

- “To be, or not to be: that is the question.
 To die: to sleep;
 No more; and by a sleep to say we end
 The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks
- That flesh is heir to, 'tis a consummation
 Devoutly to be wish'd. To die, to sleep;
 To sleep: perchance to dream; ay, there's the rub;
 For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
- When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
 Must give us pause.
 . . . But that the dread of something after death,
 The undiscovered country from whose bourne
 No traveller returns, puzzles the will,
 And makes us rather bear those ills we have
 Than fly to others that we know not of.”

Here is the whole problem, the entire doubt, and the art that draws the doubter must of necessity give no answer to the doubt. Yet Hamlet, with all his doubts, believes in Heaven and Hell, and in a Creator who

". Made us with such large discourses
Looking before and after,"
in a "Divinity that shapes our ends."

Hamlet's last words, "the rest is silence," haunting though they be, have probably no significance in his philosophy. The potter of this world passes into silence while he passes on to solve his doubts.

The subjective element in each of the great figures of course shapes their views of life and the life to come. To Macbeth the world is a place without order and without meaning. The death of the Queen is but one more event in a shadow play.

"Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more; it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury
Signifying nothing."

With *King Lear* it is otherwise. It is no shadow play. The great tragedy moves through its appointed course, a mighty drama taking the whole gamut of human nature in its scope, working out to the very verge and skyline of eternity the results of sin and error, the rewards of love and faithfulness. Scarcely a word of the future life is spoken, but the fact of that life is implied in every line of the last great Act. The play is a Divine Comedy, and the entire reconciliation of Lear and Cordelia, the perfecting of his nature, the up-filling of the cup of her love are but indications of that endless union of perfect joy which the old man yearns for, and which yet could only come with their deaths. He cries:—

"No, no, no, no! Come let's away to prison;
We two alone will sing like birds i' the cage;
When thou dost ask me blessing, I'll kneel down,
And ask of thee forgiveness: so we'll live,
And pray and sing, and tell old tales, and laugh
At gilded butterflies, and hear poor rogues
Talk of Court news; and we'll talk with them too,
Who loses and who wins; who's in, who's out;
And take upon's the mystery of things,
As if we were God's spies: and we'll wear out,
In a walled prison, packs and sets of great ones
That ebb and flow by the moon."

The old king was painting the after-life half visible in his prophetic madness. Union with Cordelia consciously and eternally

was his vision of heaven. It was the noble Kent's vision too. As the king and Cordelia lie dead before him, he turns to Albany,

"I have a journey, sir, shortly to go;
My master calls me, I must not say no."

When we turn from the great tragedies to *The Tempest* we find the quiet mysticism that to so many great minds has proved, so far as this world goes, the conclusion of the whole matter. There are realities that transcend the appearances of this world.

"Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
Are melted into air, into thin air;
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep."

It is a shallow criticism to suggest that here is the thought that death ends all. The conception is much more subtle. Life may be likened to a dream contained within a sleep that begins at birth and ends at death, a dream woven on to our personality. We are spirits, and as spirits shall vanish away. But it is the dream, the environment that is nothing, not ourselves. Yet the dream itself must be a recalling of something, must indeed be dreamt by some one. It is a purely mystic position which reconciles the fleeting world with the permanent personality. The "little life" is the dream, the awakening is the larger life in which, as the poet tells us throughout his plays in a hundred different fashions, this life fulfils itself, pays its penalties, reaps its rewards. It will, perhaps, seem a bathos to turn from the mysterious and beautiful conception of Prospero to a phrase uttered by King Henry VIII, but perhaps in it we can see something of the poet's practical outlook on that larger life. The king at the end of the play, turning to Cranmer, exclaims:—

" When I am in heaven, I shall desire
To see what this child does and praise my Maker."

Not to lose touch with this world is necessary to the bliss of another world. But reconciliation and peace, the "celestial harmony," the "eternal happiness" that Katherine beheld, must be the full note of the after-life.

"Then there is mirth in heaven,
When earthly things made even
Afove together."

But the poet, as we have said, rarely comes into actual contact with the problem and mystery of the life to come. He is ever conscious of the sacredness of

" . . . Those mysteries which heaven
Will not have earth to know." (*Cor. iv. 2.*)

and ever keeps in mind the limitations and the necessities of his art.

MUSE'S.

WATCHERS AT THE SEPULCHRE.

Let us linger in the Garden,
Where the sacred Tomb was found,
Fence the worn and hollow footway
With a thatch of roses round.
Bring we the lilies for his Passion,
Spices for his empty Bed,
Fold the fair embroidered linen
Where was laid his holy Head.

*Children of an Open Doorway,
Vanished is the form ye knew.
Shattered is the rocky threshold;
I am gone—why linger you?*

Must we then return, O Master,
To the dark and bitter Hill,
Where the Cross out-stains the midnight,
Where the sod is bleeding still,
Where the people shout and wrestle
O'er thy Raiment, shared and torn,
Shall we bow the naked shoulder,
Take the Rod of grief and scorn?

*Past for me the hour of anguish,
Far away is Calvary;
Children, I am gone before you
To your homes in Galilee.*

But in Galilee no City
Rears a palace for a King,
There no priests within a Temple
Night and day the Censer swing,
There no Ark of burning glory,
Clothed with thunder, guards for aye
Every word of law and blessing
Thy immortal lips did say.

- *Children, where the Son and Father
Meet at Man's assembled board
At the lowliest table greet Me
King, and Priest, and Silent Lord.*

May we carry then, O Master,
This thy Cross where'er we go,
Broken emblem of thy Body,
Stretched in glory and in woe?
Washed with ageless tears of sorrow
Are these stained and carven Feet,
Where the lips of Monarchs—pilgrims—
Left their penitences sweet.

*Leave the darkened Tree its burthen;
Lo, transfigured where It stood,
Living Vine and budding Branches—
Risen Sap, and purpling wood.*

Give us then the Cup and Platter,
Out of which we shared with Thee
Daily of thy toil and hunger,
And at last, thine Agony;
Grant us this, O viewless Master,
This, for all, the Common Sign—
In the bread we break together,
In the out-poured holy Wine.

*Hallowed be the sacred symbols
At your mysteries, in your home,
Ye that wait and ye that wonder
Trysting with me, till I come.*

- Till Thou come? O King of Kingdoms,
In what far and holy land
Will thy trumpets call the nations,
Will Thy Feet in judgment stand?
• Lo, we wait, and watch to greet Thee;
Trim the lamp, and lift the song,
Looking to the dark Horizon
Where Thy coming tarries long.

- *Children, turn; on faces round you
Breaks the dawn like living flame;
I in every Soul—am Risen
On whose forehead shines my Name.*

A. M. BUCKTON.

REVIEWS.

PHILOLOGY OF THE GREEK BIBLE.*

These brilliant lectures, most adequately translated from the author's manuscript by Mr. Lionel R. M. Strachan, English Lecturer in the University of Heidelberg, were delivered by Dr. Adolf Deissmann, at the Cambridge Summer School of the Free Churches, in July and August, 1907. They place before the reader in a clear and very vivid form the revolution that modern discoveries as to the character of the Greek tongue in the periods when the Greek Old Testament and the Greek New Testament came into existence have made in our appreciation of the Bible as an indivisible work. The importance of the Septuagint is likely, for the first time, to be fully realised when we appreciate how intimately it is related to the Greek New Testament.

Of all pre-Christian Greek literature Homer alone is comparable with this Bible in historical influence, and Homer, in spite of his enormous popularity, was never a Bible. Take the Septuagint in your hand, and you have before you the book that was the Bible of the Jews of the Dispersion and of the proselytes from the heathen; the Bible of Philo the philosopher, Paul the Apostle, and the earliest Christian Missions; the Bible of the whole Greek-speaking Christian world; the mother of influential daughter-versions; the mother of the Greek New Testament the parts would never have grown into the New Testament as a whole—the Canon—but for the Septuagint. The Old Greek Canon of Scripture is presupposed by the New. The history of religion displays the marvellous spectacle of the Old Bible, encircled by the apparently unscalable walls of the Canon, opening wide her gates and admitting a New Bible to the sacred precinct: the Saviour and His disciples take their place by Moses and the prophets. This cohesion between the New Testament and the Old was historically possible only because the Old Testament by its Hellenization had become assimilated in advance to the future New Testament.

The Greek Bible, however, will never become fully comprehensible until the unscientific ideas of past times as to the language in which it is written—a supposititious language known as "Biblical Greek"—are finally abandoned, and the Greek Bible is placed among its contemporary witnesses.

To see things in their true historical perspective we must place the Greek Bible in the midst of the other witnesses to the Contemporary Hellenistic world. This restoration of the Greek Bible to its own epoch is really the distinctive feature of the work of modern Bible scholarship; and by utilising the newly dis-

* "The Philology of the Greek Bible: Its Present and Future." By Adolf Deissmann, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Heidelberg; Professor Designate in the University of Berlin. Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton.

covered texts of the Hellenistic age fresh vigour has been infused into Bible scholarship, reviving and rejuvenating that somewhat torpid and inactive organism.

The most valuable for the purpose of Biblical philology of all texts are the non-literary texts—the inscriptions papyri and potsherds or ostraca. Their value is great.

“As linguistic memorials of the lower classes these humble potsherd texts shed light on many a detail of the linguistic character of our sacred Book—the Book which was written not by learned men, but by simple folk, by men who themselves confessed that they had their treasure in earthen vessels (2 Cor. iv. 17). And thus the modest ostraca rank as of equal value with the papyri and inscriptions.”

Dr. Deissmann's lecture on “The Problem of Biblical Greek” is of very great value, for it clears the way for scientific investigation of the tongue in which the New Testament was written, and sufficiently examines the essential difference between the two classes of Greek that appears in the sacred volume—“original Greek writings and translations of Semitic originals.” A portion of the New Testament, the sayings of Jesus in the synoptic Gospels for instance, are translations, while some of the so-called apocryphal books of the Old Testament are Greek originals. The translations contain a good deal of the popular Greek of their day, but they vary in quality. There was no such thing as “a uniform Greek for religious purposes” that lasted throughout the Empire from the time of Tiberius till the second century. Both translations and originals are monuments of non-literary fluctuating late Greek—a living language developing, as it is still developing in its modern form. Scholars “have established almost completely the morphology of the popular and colloquial forms of Hellenistic Greek. And we find that there is a remarkable agreement between these forms and the forms that used to be considered peculiar to New Testament or Septuagint Greek.” All non-Attic forms were formerly classed as semiticisms peculiar to the Bible. In fact, they largely belong “to the great class of international vulgarisms, and are found in vulgar papyri and inscriptions as well as in the Bible.” Semiticisms, indeed, very rarely occur in the original Greek texts; they are more frequent in the Septuagint. “They show us that in this great cosmopolitan Book the Greek cosmopolitan language was spoken by men whose home lay in the East.”

The lecture on “Septuagint Philology” is not less important. The work on this branch of investigation proceeds apace. “The Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Translations of the Old Testament,” the final part of which was issued by the Clarendon Press in 1906, by the late Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath; the Cambridge text of the Septuagint (3rd edition,

completed in 1907), by H. B. Swete; a complete critical text of the same (issue begun in 1906), are modern instances. Though no Dictionary of the Septuagint is yet available, fortunately we have R. Helburg's monumental "Septuagint Grammar" (Göttingen, 1907), "based upon an exact study of the enormous materials drawn from the three parallel sources—inscriptions, papyri, and late authors." It is time that the exegesis, the interpretation of the Greek Old Testament, proceeded on its way. It must "interpret the Greek 'Old Testament as the *Greek Bible*.'" It is difficult to overrate the importance of the text, despite the fact that our Lord did not use the Septuagint, but a Semitic Bible.

Paul, however, a child of Hellenized Judaism, used the Septuagint; and with him and after him Greek Christianity, before ever there was a New Testament, revered the Septuagint as the Bible and made it more and more a possession of its own. It has served the Christian Church of Anatolia in unbroken continuity down to the present day. It is peculiarly moving to a Bible student of our own day when, in a remote island of the Cyclades, he passes from the glaring noonday sunshine into the darkness of a little Greek chapel and finds the intercessory prayers of the Septuagint Psalms still as living on the lips of a Greek priest as they were two thousand years ago in the synagogues of Alexandria and Delos. One who has experienced that will return with new devotion to the Book of the Seventy, strengthened in the conviction that this monument of a world-wide religion is indeed worthy of thorough and profound investigation on all sides, not only because of its Hebrew original but also for its own sake.

The lecture on New Testament Philology discusses that vast subject in considerable detail. Dr. Deissmann notes that the more recent Commentaries "leave much to be desired from the philological point of view." He dwells on the value of "classical archæology in the widest sense," as shown in the work of Ramsay, Zhan, and others, to the exegesis of the New Testament. The grammarians, who have specialised on the text of the New Testament have broken down what Dr. Deissmann calls the textual "isolation of the New Testament." It has become clear that the text, "from the linguistic point of view, stands in most vital connection with the Hellenistic world surrounding it." The close consideration of the text shows us that there can hardly be more than "50 Christian new formations among the round 5,000 words of the New Testament vocabulary, that is, not 12 per cent. [as used to be asserted] but 1 per cent."

It is becoming clear, indeed, that "the stock of concepts possessed by Primitive Christianity was much more simple and transparent than used formerly to be assumed." Moreover, "the greater part of the New Testament writings is not artistic prose, but artless popular prose. . . . The importance of the New Testament in the history of style rests on the fact that through this book the

"language of natural life, that is, of course, language as it lived upon lips specially endowed by grace, made its entry into a world of outworn doctrine and empty rhetoric." Primitive Christianity, in fact, has little to do with official culture; it rejects "all the outward devices of rhetoric"; it is "intelligible in its appeal to the simple and the poor in spirit." New Testament Philology "opens up new points of view as regards its inward meaning, deepening our knowledge of Primitive Christianity and strengthening our love of the New Testament." Dr. Deissmann's enthusiastic words help us to realise the great work that science, under the guidance of thinkers such as Dr. Deissmann himself and his English and European colleagues, is doing for the whole Bible. A new age of interpretation is at hand which will give us a new appreciation of the deep springs of energy that lie in the Greek text of the Bible. We, who use the Elizabethan version, know how much depends on the spiritual environment of those whose text we read from. So with the Greek text of the Bible. Its philology will teach us new lessons, will cast new lights upon ancient words, and will give a new beauty and a new youthfulness to the documents on which we base our faith and our hope.

* * *

THE OXFORD BOOK OF FRENCH VERSE.*

The charm, if not the magnificence, of French poetry has perhaps never been more aptly exhibited than in this full and beautiful volume. Mr. Lucas is a scholar and a critic, and he has placed before us a selection of French poetry that is not only worthy of the great literature from which it is taken, but is calculated to awaken that interest and delight in French poetry that is hard to find among English readers. Here we pass from Villon to Verlaine, and realize that the passage of five centuries has not staled the sweetness and rudely swept aside the delicate sadness, or deadened the haunting aroma of the French lyric.

Prince, n'enquerez de sepmaine
Où elles sont, ne de cest an,
Que ce refrain ne vous remaine :
Mais où sont les neiges d'antan,

has a note about it, though written nearly five hundred years ago, that is not easily distinguished from Verlaine's

Qu'as-tu fait, ô toi que voilà
Pleurant sans cesse,
Dis, qu'as-tu fait, toi que voilà
De ta jeunesse ?

Both poets call in vain for vanished joys ephemeral as snow, yet unforgettable.

* *The Oxford Book of French Verse: XIIIth Century—XIXth Century.* Chosen by St. John Lucas, Oxford, at the University Press. (Price 7/6 net.)

But Mr. Lucas begins earlier than Villon. True French verse begins in the twelfth century with poems such as *Belle Erembor*, and enters the thirteenth with exquisite lyrics like the *Pastourelle* here given, of which it may be said in its own words :

La colour
Ot fresche com rose en Mai.

The *Chansons de Toile*—sewing-songs, as Mr. Lucas happily calls them—are true lyrics. “The skill with which the dialogue is presented, the few words that give the scene, and the haunting refrain, combine to endow them with a charm for which we shall sigh in vain when the Strephons and Chloes of riming Abbés and Court Anacreons strut through their self-conscious idylls.” In the twelfth and thirteenth century we are close to nature, and a kinship was set up that complexity of structure preserved rather than destroyed, preserved until the deathless Villon could incorporate it into verse that defies the touch of time. Mr. Lucas feels that the first poet “with a distinct personal utterance,” something distinguishable from what were in a sense folk songs, was Charles d’Orléans. How fresh and lovely is the note that opens this *rondeau* :

Le temps a laissé son manteau
De vent, de froidure et de pluye,
Et s’est vestu brouderie,
De soleil luyant, cler et beau.
Il y’y a beste, ne oyseau,
Qu’en son jargon ne chant ou crie :
Le temps a laissé son manteau
De vent, de froidure et de pluye.

It may seem slight, but so is every flower of spring, and the more significant for its very frailty.

Mr. Lucas, in his invaluable introduction, takes us on from the days of Villon and Marot into the period when the Italian Renaissance was reacting on the French literary tongue. “In Ronsard, however, the love of learning for its own sake soon changed into a desire to use all his knowledge in glorifying and enriching his own poverty-stricken language.” He and the *Pléiade*—the humanistic literary school—gave the French singing bird a larger cage. Perhaps the true criticism of all French verse is that it is sung from a cage, a cage of changing form and size, but always a place of stern limitations that Ariel could not suffer. But the great French poets somehow maintained their sweetness and their touch with nature though they never lost that sense of prisoned sadness (read Ronsard’s lines, *A son Amc*) which, as we have said, haunts French verse from Villon to Verlaine. Ronsard, though a humanist, “never lost his exquisite

"sense" of the beauty of youth and the spring, and the pathos of "winter in the fields and winter in the heart":

"Las! Et en moins d'une journée
Le printemps d'un homme perit."

But the classical force of the *Pliade* soon died away. If Ronsard made the Alexandrine, that which it never became in English, a power in French literature; Malherbe showed that it could be turned to uses as cold as those to which Pope turned the line of Marlowe and Shakespeare. Richelieu founded the Académie Française in 1635. "The official recognition of impersonal literature had taken place; the Alexandrine rose to icy heights of classic dignity; the "grand style" was fixed, and the path was plain for the superb "rhetoric of Corneille. The *Cid* was produced in 1637." But no age quite forgets the past or the future. La Fontaine took the people, if not the Academy, back to nature, and the classical tradition slowly decayed; though, as Mr. Lucas points out, it was a prose writer, Rousseau, "who gave the death-wound to the faded and uninspired remnants of the classical tradition and made existence "possible for lyric poetry." Chateaubriand and Madame de Staël created what became the French romantic tradition, making France familiar with the great English romanticists, and in 1820 Lamartine "inaugurated the great period of French lyrical verse." His voice was immediately joined by those of Victor Hugo—the greatest by far, Mr. Swinburne declares, of all French poets—Alfred de Vigny, and Alfred de Musset. The movement had as its critical conscience the great Sainte-Beuve, the greatest of all critics. The Academy surrendered, and then came "a recrudescence of that spirit of orderliness "which seems eternal in French literature." The new classical spirit gave new and almost Shakespearean harmonies to the romanticists, to all but one, Théophile Gautier, who moved along the lines of romantic convention, and founded the formal school that M. Sully Prudhomme represented. For the moment that school has won the day. Hugo freed himself from formalism with a Shakespearean personal force, and created his own majestic limitations; but in spite of this new hope of literary development the ancient tradition has returned. Form is literature to the French mind. But the influence of Hugo cannot for ever lie silent. French literature may yet burst from its cage in song unfettered as the skylark's. Hugo may be its Shakespeare.

* * *

THE HISTORY OF THE WEST.*

"The General History of Western Nations from 5000 B.C. to 1900 A.D." is described by its talented author as "the result of

* "The General History of Western Nations from 5000 B.C. to 1900 A.D.," by Emil Reich, Doctor Juris. Vols. I. and II. (Antiquity). Messrs. Macmillan & Co., price 15/- net.

"twenty-seven years' study of the literary and monumental sources of history, and of the close observation and analysis, *in loco*, of "twenty different types of contemporary civilisation." It is a work of great length and, if we may say so, pertinacity. Dr. Reich's introductory essay on "The Grammar of History" is a brilliant piece of work, full of epigram ("Nature grows *seriatim*; man *gregatim*") and keen thinking. Much we may disagree with appears in the essay: it is obviously untrue to write: "the Christian religion was essentially dynamic before the Council of Trent, but considerably less so ever since." The expansive tendencies of Christianity have increased with "les variations" that Bossuet so eloquently deplored. Dr. Reich's high estimate of Buckle is certainly surprising. We prefer Dr. Villari's estimate. But though we may not always agree with Dr. Reich's *obiter dicta*, no one will deny the brilliant insight and sound judgment that distinguish the general thought contained in this Introduction. His repudiation of the doctrine of chance in the evolution of history is a fine piece of thought. There is no chance in the determining movements of history. Desaix may have saved Marengo, but "it is now certain that the fate of the Austrians was strategically sealed long before the actual battle took place." The timely approach of Grouchy might have turned the tide at Waterloo, but Waterloo would not have saved the Empire. Dr. Reich, as a specialist "on the study of general facts," places before us the series of "general facts" that have given Europe the predominance in world history. He dwells on the weight of "geo-political causes," of "the production and distribution of wealth," of "the relation of man to woman," of "the historic personality" in world politics, such as, to take a modern instance, Bismarck—of national ideals. "These are the five principal correlative forces which make history." Dr. Reich deliberately places on one side Race and Religion as general forces that make history. We may be forgiven if we disagree with him, and may perhaps be allowed to mention Disease (the Yellow, the Black Death) as a force that has played a determining part in history; and last, but certainly not least, Overcrowding. From Power and Forces, Dr. Reich turns to Sources for our knowledge of history. In connection with the interpretation of sources, he discusses the question as to the relation of the idea of evolution to the explanation of the facts of history. He regards the technical theory of evolution as quite helpless. Again we disagree, and refer him to the work now being done in tracing the evolution of the races and tongues of the Mediterranean or Dr. Vinogradoff's work on "The Evolution of Classes in England in the Eleventh Century." All students, however, will read the section on "Sources of General History" with attention and profit. Dr. Reich's immense range of knowledge, if at times untempered, is seen at its best in this type of work. We must mention

briefly the actual scope of the history. The first book deals with the great inland empires, Chaldea, Egypt, Assyria; with the classical "nations"—the Phœnicians, the Hebrews, the Hellenes. The second book deals fully with the Greeks and the Greek City State. The position and influence of Sparta is adequately considered, and this is followed by an elaborate treatment of Athens. The position of Demosthenes as a statesman and the decline of Athens are treated very fully, and the volume closes with an account of the Macedonian ascendancy. The second volume contains books three to seven, which deal with the history of Rome. The third and fourth bring us to the end of the Punic Wars; the fifth gives us the expansion of Rome in the Eastern half of the Mediterranean; the sixth "The First Century B.C. and the Empire"; while the seventh deals with "The Roman Principate, Roman Law, Roman Literature." The range of Dr. Reich's reading amazes the reader. It is surely audacious, but certainly delightful, to know, so much.

THE ECONOMICS OF POVERTY.*

Space will not allow of anything more than a reference to these two important books, but we venture very earnestly to call the attention of all persons interested in or engaged in the administration of charity or relief, to them. They are inexpensive and they are full of information for the administrator (from Mr. John Burns downwards) and warnings to the charitable. Miss Loane's essays introduce us to the poor of almost every class, and we see them "from their point of view." We are shown many of the things that create and prolong poverty. Miss Loane is absolutely right in her account of the manufacture of the pauper. Children neglected or mal-fed between the earliest days and the days when it is usual for work to begin become tramps. They are fit for nothing else. Boys who are taught no trade, but acquire instead "the precocious independence of an errand boy"—there are thousands of these—drift first into the ranks of unskilled labour, and thence to casual labour, and on into the ignoble army of tramps. The hatred of control that leads to this is as noticeable with girls as with boys. But the hatred of brain work is even more difficult to deal with. The dulllest mechanical work with long hours is preferred to work that involves thought. "More men are tramps, and more women are miserable housewives if married, or underpaid slaves if single, because they cannot, or will not, use their brain power, than because they are too lazy for hard bodily labour." "Cheapness" is the cry that transforms men and women into tramps. Low-priced

* (1) "Foreign Solutions of Poor Law Problems." By Edith Sellers, Author of "The Danish Poor Relief System." (Messrs. Horace Marshall & Son. Price 2/6 net.)
 (2) "From Their Point of View." By M. Loane, Author of "The Queen's Poor." (Mr. Edward Arnold).

labour, whether of children or men or married women, is always dear to the employer, to the employed, and to the community. The panacea that Miss Loane recommends is in effect the adoption of a personal and a poor law policy that will tend to create a sense of and a desire for independence. How such a sense can save a man from all that tramping means is shown by the story (told here) of the man who, forced to leave work through an unreasonable strike, took to the road with his wife and five children, and tramped with his few household goods for a whole year. At the end of that time the family life was still intact, and the man obtained permanent work once more. Such a case proves that the end to aim at in all cases is the creation and preservation of the sense of independence. Miss Loane's criticism of a great part of modern social service is that it pauperises men, women and children alike. Her point of view, deliberately adopted after a wide range of experience, calls for the closest consideration.

Miss Sellers, in her ample examination of foreign methods of dealing with pauperism, has much the same lesson to teach. Our system of poor relief is discredited on the Continent. "No State now when bent on reforming the poor relief system sends its envoys here to learn how the work is to be done: it is to Vienna, Copenhagen, Berlin, or Budapest, that it sends them now." Our vast and fruitless expenditure is regarded as reckless in the extreme. Our destitute children cost us a pound a week a head, and grow up with the pauper taint. In Germany and Hungary the ruinous system of institutions, with its pauperising results, has no place. The children who need help are boarded out at the expense, if possible, of the parents, but under the close supervision of the State. Family life is the germ of society, and every destitute child, unless its mental or physical condition positively forbids it, is, after being received in a refuge, grafted into a family. The system in Hungary is as cheap as it is effective. The cost is about one-seventh of the cost here, and the results bear no comparison. The same may be said of the system in force in Berlin. Our system seems designed for the support of architects, contractors, officials, and corrupt guardians of the poor. The sooner it is abolished the better will it be for the credit of our civilisation. But it is not only the children who are looked after in Austria. It is true that in Berlin the aged poor are not as well treated as here, and out-relief is ill-managed, but this is not the case in Vienna. There the aged are well looked after, while the law in the case of the able-bodied really attempts to differentiate between the loafer and the worker. The one weak point in Vienna is the "after-care" of the destitute boys and girls who, on attaining the age of fourteen, are left to their own resources. The Austrian Penal Workhouse has been a great success. "Of the 293 men who were sent to Kornenburg in 1901-2, only seven had

ever been there before." The material gathered at first hand by Miss Sellers is most valuable, and we strongly recommend the book to all who are engaged in relief work. The great problem is how to avoid pauperising the poor, and how to create and foster the sense of independence; and in these books the problem takes a hopeful and a new aspect.

THE EVOLUTION OF TRAGEDY.

Professor C. E. Vaughan's "Types of the Tragic Drama" is a careful and courageous attempt to introduce scientific unity into a subject which seems very easy, but is most difficult to classify. His thesis is clearly stated in his introduction; it is that "the general line of development has been from exclusion to inclusion, from a less to a more complete idealisation of the material afforded by human life. . . . It has been, on the whole, a change from the presentation of action to the presentation of character, a gradual shifting of the scene from that which is without to that which is within." In tracing this development the author adheres to the common division of drama into the "Classical" and the "Romantic." He clearly recognises that all drama is founded on conventions of one kind or another, and that the two divisions shade off into one another by imperceptible gradations, and he abstains, perhaps wisely, from attempting any actual definition of "Classicism" and "Romance." One may note a similar laxity in his use of the words "realism" and "idealism" throughout the volume. Now, undoubtedly, a too narrow application of such generalisations is a frequent rock of offence to criticism, but at the same time, if they are to be used at all, a little more precision is desirable, especially in a subject where the development has been as sporadic and as strongly influenced by convention and external circumstance, as has that of Tragedy. Professor Vaughan has been compelled by the space at his command (the volume is a collection of lectures) to stick closely to generalities, and he has, perhaps, been a little carried away by his thesis. Thus he is compelled to combat the theory that Euripides was a "realist." To fit the author's scheme he must be classed as a "Romanticist" in embryo. No doubt Euripides was not a "realist" as we speak of "realism" to-day, but his bent of mind was undoubtedly towards realism. His prime object was to grapple with the problem of life as it is, not to fit facts into a conventional scheme. The strange phenomenon that, as Professor Vaughan notes, he was in his use of many of the conventions of the classical stage even more irrational than his predecessors, is due to a carelessness of externals attributable to this very "realism." His heart was not in the conventions which necessity compelled him to accept. Again, though Professor Vaughan justly estimates the great influence

*Messrs. Macmillan & Co., 5/- net.

of Seneca on the Renaissance dramatists of England and France, he is perhaps misled by the fidelity with which the Roman carried on the tradition of Euripides to attach too much importance to him as an artistic individuality. Professor Vaughan's main thesis is undoubtedly true, and he has worked it out clearly and picturesquely, though he is, as has been indicated, a little under the tyranny of words. If one thinks of "realism" as the tendency to adapt convention to the intellectual needs of succeeding generations, and of "idealism" as the instinct of selection, in general either consciously or unconsciously employed with an ethical object, there is no hostility between the two ideas, and there is no need to explain away the "realism" of Euripides or Ibsen, as Professor Vaughan, who rightly regards "idealism" as essential to all great art, is apt to do. In fact, the Progress to Realism will then sum up the whole history of the drama. Other influences have, of course, to be taken into account, and there is one at least to which Professor Vaughan has, perhaps, paid too little attention—that of personality. It is clearly misleading, for example, to take as two of the three chosen representatives of the modern stage such intensely personal and isolated figures as Browning and Maeterlinck. One must not look to "Tragedy" as opposed to "Comedy" for the development of the modern drama. "Realism" tends to rob the word "Tragedy" of its distinctive meaning.

* * *

IN MEMORIAM.*

The three further volumes of the "Eversley" Edition of Tennyson go a long way towards the completion of this final edition of the poet's works, with its invaluable annotations by the author, and the final editorial comments by his son. It need hardly be said that the production of the work is admirable, both in printing, binding and in convenience of size. The *Idylls* may now be read in their separate volume with a new sense of completeness, detachment and unity. Their charm grows with the passing years, and whatever may grow stale in a new age, it may certainly be predicted that Tennyson's version of the great Arthurian legend will remain the permanent monument of that legend in the light of modern thought and inspiration. The earlier beauty of the *Princess* and *Maud* still stands untarnished. It has the complete Tennysonian note, and perhaps there is no greater proof of the poet's claim to permanent recognition than the persistence of his poetic personality throughout his works, from *Timbuctoo* to the second *Locksley Hall*. But Tennyson as a prophet and a teacher stands or falls with *In Memoriam*. When Queen Victoria said to him, on the publication

* *The Eversley Edition of Tennyson*: Enoch Arden and In Memoriam; The Princess and Maud; The Idylls of the King. Messrs. Macmillan and Co. (Price 4/- net per volume.)

of the Dedication to the Idylls of the King, "Next to the Bible, "*In Memoriam* is my comfort," she struck a note that echoed in the hearts of myriads of her subjects. *In Memoriam* was the voice of the prisoners of hope throughout English-speaking lands. Is it so to-day? Is the work written under the burden, the fearful oppression of the loss of a most dear and beloved friend, Arthur Henry Hallam, as capable to-day of meeting and dissipating the doubts of the doubter as it was between the years 1850, when it was first issued to a few friends, and (say) the year 1862, when the Queen spoke of it in such terms of spiritual obligation? Bishop Westcott was impressed by the poet's "splendid faith (in the "face of the frankest acknowledgment of every difficulty) in the "growing purpose of the sum of life, and in the noble destiny of the "individual man as he offers himself for the fulfilment of his little "part (liv, lxxxix, lxxxii, and the closing stanzas). This faith has "now largely entered into our common life, and it seems to me to "express a lesson of the Gospel which the circumstances of all time "encourage us to master." This was written after the poet's death, and shows us how men who lived through the spiritual storm and stress of the mid-Victorian period felt the permanent effects of the poem. Professor Sidgwick also, writing after the poet's death, declared that

what *In Memoriam* did for us, for me at least, in this struggle was to impress on us the ineffaceable and ineradicable conviction that *humanity* will not and cannot acquiesce in a godless world If the possibility of a "godless world" is excluded, the faith thus restored is, for the poet, unquestionably a form of Christian faith: there seems to him no reason for doubting that the

Sinless years
That breathed beneath the Syrian blue
and the marvel of the life continued after the bodily death, were
a manifestation of the "immortal love" which by faith we
embrace as the essence of the Divine nature.

These great thinkers felt beyond doubt that Tennyson's influence on the question of faith was not merely an influence helpful to his own generation, but was destined to be incorporated in the general thought and hope of the race. To younger thinkers the same feeling, even intensified, must come. To-day is the day of science, of *knowing*, and Tennyson was essentially the poet of that mental or spiritual attitude. Professor Sidgwick refers to a note in *Nature*, at the time of the poet's death, claiming him as pre-eminently the Poet of Science, and points out the difference between Wordsworth and Tennyson—the former being a lover of Nature "as known by "simple observation and interpreted by religious and sympathetic "intuition," while the latter was dominated by the scientific view of

Nature. We should prefer to put it differently. Wordsworth took the Mystic, while Tennyson took the Scientific view of natural phenomena. They are correlative schools of thought, and both at the present moment loom largely in the minds of men. But Tennyson's view is really the view that should precede the other in the development or progress of the thinking mind. If one poet can elicit from the essential orderliness of things the certainty of a guiding Mind watching over immortal souls, the other naturally follows, to create, here and now, that intimacy between Creator and creature which is the essence of the mystic position preached implicitly in Wordsworth's deep thoughts about Nature. *In Memoriam* then is likely to grow rather than fade as a force playing a definite part in the upholding of the Christian faith. The advance of science has established, in a great measure, the position of legitimate faith peering forth from legitimate doubt for which Tennyson strove. But science and its advance is not a matter for the multitude, or even for the average thinking man or woman. None but specialists can grapple with its technical terms of art; but all can turn with infinite profit and an understanding mind to the same conclusions expressed in *In Memoriam* with a charm and subtlety of language, with a rhythm, a haunting and variable cadence, hard to equal in the long annals of English verse. Perfect in form, it carries the simple theology of a great and simple mind into the hearts of thinking men. Tennyson's faith was noble. He faced all difficulties, all doubts, and remained a believer in the fundamental fact of Christianity.

"But Death returns an answer-sweet:
 'My sudden frost was sudden gain,
 And gave all ripeness to the grain,
 It might have drawn from after-heat.'
 * * *
 Eternal process moving on,
 From state to state the spirit walks;
 And these are but the shatter'd stalks,
 Or ruin'd chrysalis of one.
 Nor blame I Death, because he bare
 The use of virtue out of earth;
 I know transplanted human worth
 Will bloom to profit, elsewhere."

That is the Easter faith, and it was held by one who faced all the doubts of the most sceptic age Europe has known. To-day we are not, *when we think*, sceptics at all. Tennyson's complaint against us would be that we do not think with the intensity of his day and generation.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Professor Graham Kerr has published at the Cambridge University Press the Zoological papers of the late Mr. John Samuel Budgett, Balfour Student of the University, to which is prefixed a memoir of Mr. Budgett by Mr. A. E. Shipley (25s. net). It is the life of a born scientist, who devoted himself, as soon as he reached maturity, to the investigation of the breeding habits of two obscure fishes, only found in tropical waters. To this end he undertook three separate prolonged journeys to the Gambia and one to Uganda, the African lakes and the Nile, besides an earlier visit, in company with Professor Graham Kerr, to South America. The text as a whole is only intelligible to Zoologists; but no reader can fail to be struck with this typical model of the scientific character. From his boyhood Mr. Budgett was devoted to morphology, a pursuit in which he was largely directed by the late Professor W. K. Parker. Modest, persevering, laborious, he went his way to his own ends with resolute devotion, and died at an early age of fever contracted in the African swamps where his fishes bred and his observations lay, a true martyr to science. Such thirst for knowledge is given to few, such self-suppressing modesty to fewer still, and we cannot do better than quote a sentence in which his friend Mr. Shipley describes his character:—

Budgett had all the features of the best type of Englishmen. He was courageous, courteous, long-suffering and absolutely loyal; patient when ill and cheerful under physical discomfort and suffering, very pertinacious, with a strong sense of duty and of personal honour, kind to a degree but always considerably and quietly so. He hated advertisement and always kept himself in the background. He was just the sort of man who makes the backbone of the governing classes of our Colonies and Dependencies, reliable, resourceful, the man whom we can trust.

"Final Natural History Essays," by Graham Kershaw, M.B., F.Z.S. (Messrs. Sherratt and Hughes, London, price 6s. net), is the third of three volumes containing in all "a series of sixty essays dealing with typical examples of the class Mammalia. In this work, as in its predecessors, the subject has throughout been viewed from the combined standpoint of the zoologist and the historian; the photographs are selected from a series of over five hundred negatives taken by the author." This very valuable volume deals with twenty-four mammals, including the so-called Cat of Madagascar, that is to say the Ring-tailed Lemur, the Ocelot Cat, the European Bison (*Bos bonasus*), the Nilgai Antelope, the European Beaver, the Tasmanian Devil, and the Duck-Billed Platypus. It is curious to note that the prosimian race in Madagascar has a real cat—the fossa—as enemy. It is a terrible creature, and is "related both to the cats and to the civets, having retractile claws like the former, but plantigrade feet like the latter animal." The Ocelot (*Felix pardalis*) is the biggest of the small cats. It is an inhabitant of Central and South America, and varies in size from that of the English wild cat to that of a small leopard. The name is a corruption of the old Mexican name *Thalocelotl*. It seems as capable of being tamed as the cat. The European bison once ranged over Spain, Switzerland, Germany, Russia and Poland, but to-day it, "as a truly wild animal, is now confined to the rugged district of the Caucasus: a herd under the protection of the Russian Government is maintained in the famous forest of Bialowicsa, in Lithuania. It is a great animal, standing six feet at the shoulder and measuring over ten feet "from the tip of the muzzle to the root of the tail." The weight of an adult "is at least up to 1,700 lbs." It is a bigger and a more powerful animal than the American buffalo or bison, though the young are very similar. The bison is not to be confused with the urus, now extinct, though "some strain of urus blood probably persists in the half-wild cattle

"of a few English parks." The Nilgai antelope (*Boselophus tragocamelus*) is the only modern representative of a purely African race. The interesting point about this animal is the fact that it is most suitable for acclimatisation in Europe. The European beaver has long been extinct in England and is nearly extinct on the Continent, occurring only in the Rhone Valley in a wild state, and under protection on the lower Danube, and in Norway. The Tasmanian Devil (*Sarcophilus ursinus*) is a small beast the size of a badger, but it is the most vicious and bloodthirsty creature in existence. In two nights one in Sydney slaughtered 54 fowls, six geese and an albatross. The Black-Billed Platypus, of Australia, is interesting as one of the few mammals that lay eggs. It belongs to another epoch of the world's history.

* * *

It is not often that the critic is confronted with a young poet whose execution is manifestly inferior to his thought. This, however, is the case with Mr. Harold Monro's "Judas" (Samurai Press, price 1s.). In the poem, which is in form a blank verse reconstruction of the gospel story of Judas Iscariot, the central figure is at once the subject of a very real and dramatic psychological study, and a symbol of the eternal antagonism of materialist and mystic. In both branches the design is admirably and coherently executed. There is no difficulty in seeing on which side Mr. Monro's sympathies lie, but he has artistic perception enough to know that, if his poem is to be essentially true or essentially dramatic, he must state the case of Judas and the world with compassion and even sympathy. This he has the courage to do. And he has, moreover, imagination enough to make the story and its protagonist real and living. It would be useless, however, to attempt to give any idea of the truth and power of the poem by any analysis of its contents. It is unfortunate that Mr. Monro's verse lacks the distinction of his subject matter. To be frank, the story might almost as well have been written in prose. Not that the verse is bad or even careless, but it is throughout monotonous and ineffectual. The endings are almost entirely monosyllabic, and there is practically no variety of rhythm. Moreover, Mr. Monro does not yet possess much individuality of style. None the less, "Judas" deserves to be read, and will, it is to be hoped, find an audience.

* * *

Mr. T. H. T. Case in his "Songs and Poems" (David Nutt, price 1s.), touches the opposite pole. He writes throughout with ease and precision, and often with considerable power of expression; moreover, he shows some command of metre. His poems do not, however, reveal much depth of feeling or individuality of thought. His chief sources of inspiration seem to be a gentle pessimism (perhaps best expressed in his lines on "Progress" which have a ring of Fitzgerald's "Omar") and a very genuine feeling for his native Norfolk, to which he owes much of his most effective work. Mr. Case should avoid such obvious imitation of well-known writers as

"The mock of the mirth that maddens
the moan of the sin that sighs,"
or as occurs in his "Labitur Vita," which begins—
"In the lonesome hour that's blackest,
darkest ere the day be born."

He can afford to depend on his own inspiration.

* * *

The editing of Martial for the use of schools is a dangerous business. So much of his best work must perforce be omitted, and so much of his worst is fatally adapted to academic purposes, being difficult,

instructive, and uninteresting. Messrs. R. T. Bridge and E. D. C. Lake in editing their "Select Epigrams from Martial, Books VII. to XII." (Oxford, Clarendon Press), have kept these dangers before their eyes. To avoid overlading the text and exhausting the reader with notes, they have included in their preface a summary of some of the features of social life at Rome to which the poet makes most frequent reference, as, for instance, the relation of Patronus and Clien, the nature of Roman books, etc. Out of further consideration for the reader they have made their notes as short and explanatory as possible, and have prefaced those on each epigram with a summary of its contents. Altogether, the book is admirably done, and should be welcome alike to teachers and pupils.

The *Journal* published by the Society of Comparative Legislation is performing a work of great importance in bringing to the notice of jurists legislative movements throughout the world, as well as by the publication of papers by well-known legal writers dealing with juridical problems of moment. The current number (New Series, Vol. VIII, part 2, Mr. John Murray, 5s.) contains the address delivered by Mr. Bryce to the American Bar Association in August, 1907, on "The Influence of National Character and Historical Environment on the Development of the Common Law." He dwells upon "the substantial identity of the two branches of the old stock" in England and the United States, and points out that the racial mixture of the American people has not much affected this identity in the doctrine and practice of the law. A very important suggestion is made in another paper, "With respect to the systematic collection of information as to primitive laws, more especially those of communities within the British Empire." Prompt action is necessary if a *corpus* of primitive law is to be made, since contact with civilisation is rapidly corrupting the primitive elements. Attention should at once be given to the Colonies, and persons with special knowledge are invited to supply information as to distinct sets of laws and usages where such have been collected, as to the state, imperfect or otherwise, of such collections, and as to the means of making such collections where none exist. The editors of the *Journal* will publish all information supplied to them. Sir Lewis Tupper supplies information of the type required in his paper here printed on "Customary and Other Law in the East Africa Protectorate." The volume gives an invaluable review of legislation throughout the world for the year 1906, and numerous notes on various juridical questions.

We are indebted to a most distinguished foreign author for a complete study of an English institution. Dr. Josef Redlich's book on the procedure of our House of Commons (now translated into English (Messrs. Constable, 1908, 3 vols., 31s. 6d. net) is not only an important work, but unique as a history of our Parliamentary procedure, and to those who watch the transactions of the House of Commons we may fairly call it fascinating. Its value is enhanced by a preface and a supplementary chapter, giving the details of the changes in practice since 1905, written by Sir Courtenay Ilbert, who is not only a professional student, but, we may assume, an adviser in the recent and still incomplete reforms. The procedure of the House is not only deeply rooted in our history, but still retains a mass of antiquarian interest. Take, for example, the instance given in the preface: the forms observed in bringing in a Bill. The old form, three centuries ago, was (1) a general debate on an alleged grievance; (2) reference to a small Committee to devise a remedy; (3) leave given, on the application of the

spokesman of the Committee, to introduce the Bill; (4) after an interval for drafting it, Bill introduced. This is now boiled down to (1) motion by a member for leave to bring in the Bill, which granted (2) the Speaker asks, "Who will propose and bring in the Bill?" which is answered by the proposer, giving the names on the back of the Bill; (3) the proposer goes to the Bar and returns to the table with a piece of paper which is supposed to be the Bill, but is usually a mere blank. It is really a piece of dumb show, merely symbolical; but is curiously characteristic of English ways. The question of procedure, as is here shown, is closely bound up with our Constitutional history, the methods of the House being not only convenient instruments, but actual forces in our Government. At the same time most of the great changes wrought by the Cabinet and party system were worked within the historic lines of procedure. It has been the rise of democratic power, and the strain put by it upon the older system, down to the Reform Bill of 1832, which has compelled and is still urging new procedure rules. The chief interest of a work like this for the general reader lies in the question of the efficiency of Parliament as a legislating and controlling body. We have to do with the modern phenomenon of obstruction, which necessitates the alteration of rules, the closure, and any other means of securing the power to act. "Parliamentary conventions," says Dr. Redlich,

"are only effective, and the parliamentary government which they support is only possible, when there is an *acceptance of the constitutional basis* upon which State and Parliament are founded. Irreconcilable parties, which oppose an existing union of States or stand for a subordination of State to Church, parties which reject the whole framework of society or which draw their life from a principle only less deep and powerful than that of religion—the principle of nationality, are all in mortal conflict—latent if not apparent, possibly unconscious for long periods—with the conventions of parliaments; they are, therefore, knowingly or unknowingly attacking parliamentary government itself, at all events in the form known to the Constitution. Obstruction is, in reality, nothing less than a *repudiation* of the existing constitution of the country, intensified to the point of denying the right of its parliament to exist, and expressed in a conscious misuse of the forms and principles of procedure essential to the efficiency of parliamentary action.

It was no mere coincidence that the assault on the British Constitution by the principle of nationality brought obstruction to maturity. On looking round in Europe, wherever we see a similar spectacle, we find that it is almost always a conflict of nationalities, a struggle against existing unions of States, which has brought it forth."

Sir C. P. Ilbert, in his supplementary chapter, gives a clear account of the new rules of procedure established during the past few sessions, rules founded on a scheme which has as yet, from want of time, been only partially agreed to. He points out the obvious fact that the business of the House has increased enormously with the rise of democracy: it is not only occupied with the legislation of an ever more complex civilization: it has to watch and control the administration of a vast empire, under a growing theory of the duties of Government. Relief must be had somehow: and in our opinion it can only be obtained by devolution on a large scale. Home Rule may be slow in coming, but it will have to be drastically applied. Meanwhile the House last year passed the well-known momentous resolution insisting on its right to over-ride the views of the House of Lords.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. POEM: ADEIMANTUS. By A. B. S. TENNYSON	1
2. REVIEWS	3
THE PAN-ANGELICAN CHURCH. MONTAGUE BURROWS. EARLY ENGLAND. MISS COLERIDGE'S POEMS. EGYPTIAN PAPYRI.	
4. SHORTER REVIEWS: Short History and Description of Bow Church, Cheapside, etc.	16
5. NOTICES OF BOOKS	19
6. NOTES	22

ADEIMANTUS.

THE dream of Adeimantus,
 Who carved for a Grecian Prince
 Statues of perfect marble
 Fairer than all things since,
 Wonderful, white and gracious,
 Like lotus flowers on a mere,
 Or phantoms born of the moonbeam,—
 Beyond all praise but a tear.
 The dream of Adeimantus,
 As he lay upon his bed,
 Wonderful white and gracious,
 And this was the word it said:
 "Arise, oh Adeimantus,
 "The breath of the dawn blows chill,
 "The stars begin to fade
 "'Ere the first ray strikes the sill
 "Arise, oh Adeimantus,
 "For here is work to your hand,
 "If the fingers fashion the dream
 "As the soul can understand."
 He rose from his troubled bed
 'Ere the dream had faded away,
 And he said "I will fashion the dream
 "As the potter fashions the clay."
 He said in his great heart's vanity
 "I will fashion a wondrous thing
 "To stand in a palace of onyx
 "And blind the eyes of a king."

He said in the pride of his soul
 As the birds began to sing,
 "I will surely take no rest
 "Till I fashion this wondrous thing.
 "I will swear an oath to eschew
 "The white wine and the red,
 "To eat no delicate meats
 "Nor break the fair white bread,
 "I will not walk in the city,
 "But labour here alone
 "In the dew and the dusk and the flush
 "Till the vision smiles from the stone."
 Six days he wrought at the marble
 But cunning had left his hand,
 And his fingers would not fashion
 What his soul could understand,
 Six days he fasted and travailed,
 Hard was the watch to keep,
 Till the chisel fell from his fingers
 And he sank with a sob to sleep.
 Then a vision came to his slumber,
 Beautiful as before,
 Floating in with the moonbeam
 Gliding over the floor.
 It floated in with the moonbeam
 And stood beside his bed,
 Wonderful white and gracious,
 And thus was the word it said:
 "Courage, oh Adeimantus,
 "I am the perfect thing
 "To stand in a shrine of jasper
 "And blind the eyes of a king.
 "I am the strange desire,
 "The glory beyond the dream,
 "The passion above the song,
 "The spirit-light of the gleam.
 "I come to my best beloved
 "Not actual, from afar,
 "Fairer than hope or thought
 "More beautiful than a star.
 "Courage, oh Adeimantus,
 "Lay strength and strength to your soul,
 "You shall fashion me in part,
 "And know the perfect whole."

A. B. S. TENNYSON.

REVIEWS.

THE PAN-ANGLICAN CHURCH.*

The Pan-Anglican Congress, which takes place during the present month in London, is the most significant event of our time in the history of the Episcopal Churches of the Anglican Communion, and it is a pleasure to turn from the internal discussions of the National Church in England (discussed in one of the books before us by Canon Hensley Henson) to the high ideals and practical aspirations of the conveners of the Congress. All who are interested in the Congress, and these will include many members of the Free Churches, should read the admirable work, entitled "Mankind and the Church," edited by Bishop Montgomery, the secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Here we have seven essays: one by the editor on the National Church; one by the Bishop of New Guinea on the Papuans—a most illuminating monograph on the place of a child-race in the Church of Christ; an essay by the Archbishop of the West Indies on "The special influence which the African or negro race may exercise on the future developments of Christianity," in which we have an elaborate discussion of the race, its personal characteristics, and its form of Christianity. The fourth and fifth essays discuss "The Contributions of the Churches of Japan and China to the Body of Christ." Dr. Lefroy, the Bishop of Lahore, takes as his theme, "The Mohammedan Races: Their Contributions to the Body of Christ"; while the former Bishop of Bombay, Dr. Mylne, discusses under the text "The Hidden Riches of Secret Places," "the possible service of Hinduism to the collective thought of the Church." The mere recital of the subjects of these essays suggests their value, and we earnestly recommend their perusal and careful study, not only to those who are interested in foreign missions, but to all who see in these great missionary movements a new force in the sociological development of the world. It is a curious fact that the present unrest in India synchronises with a very rapid development not only of Christianity, but of Christian ideas and ideals in heathen guise, and it may be, as was, we believe, recently pointed out by the Bishop of Lahore, that the unrest has its good as well as its evil side, and may indicate the dissolution of that mental immobility which has made India the despair of the missionary. The Mohammedan races

* (1) "Mankind and the Church: being an attempt to estimate the contribution of great races to the fulness of the Church of God." By Seven Bishops. Edited with an introduction by the Right Rev. H. H. Montgomery, D.D. (Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co.) (2) "Three Hundred Years of the Episcopal Church in America." By George Hodges, Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. (G. W. Jacobs & Co., Philadelphia.) (3) "The National Church." By H. Hensley Henson. (Messrs. Macmillan & Co.)

have much to teach the Christian races about the reality of God, the objectivity of truth, the value of faith and reverence. It is always well to remember that it was Moorish Mohammedans who taught Latin chivalry that respect for, that worship of woman which was one of the most striking social facts of the Middle Ages.

Dr. Mylne points out that Hindoo thought also has much to give us:

"The feel of God in all things, the sense sympathetic to his touch, as it thrills through the universe around us, the consciousness that all that exists is impregnated with Him and with His influence, that 'He is not far from each one of us,' 'that in Him we live, and move, and have our being'—these animating characteristics which pervade the mind of India, which constitute its spiritual atmosphere, which are categories in all its speculations—it is by these, as a gift from on high, that Christianity may look to be helped. We may be warmed, enlightened, enriched; may be protected against weaknesses which are our own, and may be led to a many-sided breadth which is far from being native to ourselves, by contact with Indian Christians inheriting a sense of the supernatural from their ancestors bred up in Pantheism."

When we turn to Dr. Montgomery's own contribution to this remarkable volume we find an introductory essay, as broad and charitable as it is illuminating and penetrating. He is an Englishman to the core, but he touches salient English failings with a tender but unhesitating hand. He says of the Englishman, "I do not believe he sees God easily. . . His Creator knows that it is hard for him not to be an agnostic. . . It is, indeed, one of the marvels of history that our race has become an apostle and herald of the faith. We do not lack fibre, but, more than any other, we need a broken heart; and that fracture was effected by the power of the Gospel." His striking tribute to the Free Churches, and his realization of the fact that such Churches are an inevitable product of the race, must be read to be appreciated. The fact of the dualism in Anglican Christianity—the cleavage into those who need and those who do not need sacraments and ordinances—is an immense strength in our missionary work. "The Church of the Far West has so far, it seems to me, a great advantage over the Latin or 'the Orthodox.' And in the Continents to be vanquished for Christ's sake there is abundant scope for every quality and all the experience we possess." Of course, Dr. Montgomery feels the fundamental value of his own orders. His experience among foreign races makes him believe that

"the stability of Christianity depends upon the Catholic Church and its order and temper. The only anchor that can hold till the end, in spite of any storm from whatever direction, is the Catholic anchor, with its long, unbroken chain. . . . It is possible,

fortunately, to say this with unfeigned respect, with genuine affection, for those who do not agree with us. And it is possible also to say it, holding firm at the same time to the habit we have of tearing off from the building, which we love so much, the growths which hurt it. The chain of the anchor has to be constantly examined and carefully hosed, to prevent the action of creatures that eat holes in it, or to wash away the thick incrustations of mud upon it. This is our Protestantism."

Dr. Montgomery, unlike Canon Henson, is not afraid of the Latin Church. "The Time-Spirit is against the Latin Church among every race except the Latin. Slowly it is altering the extent of its influence in other than Latin regions, perhaps unconsciously to itself." Nationalism in Church life is the goal that Dr. Montgomery sees far ahead of us. "We shall never obtain the true contribution of any Church to the Body of Christ till the Church of that land is racy of the soil while it remains Catholic." He applies this principle to the great far-off races, and sees a vision of many Churches making one, a vision of a New Renaissance, of, at last, a new Heaven and a new Earth, and a finally organised attack upon the evil forces of the world.

It is depressing to turn from the reasoned optimism of Bishop Montgomery's volume to Canon Henson's lengthy volume on the National Church and his curious patronage of the great principles of the Reformation and of the great reformers. Rightly or wrongly, the reader feels that Canon Henson is hardly the man to deal with the want of unity in the Church of England. His own contradictions of authority do not make for peace, and render him incompetent to intervene judicially in the various questions of the hour. Bishop Montgomery's view of the Latin Church in reality disposes of much that Canon Henson says. The English nation are passionately Protestant at heart, and the action of a certain number of foolish young clergy will not alter national characteristics. Moreover, Canon Henson, though a learned and industrious writer, is neither a historian nor a lawyer. His explanation of the rubric as to daily services as an attempt "to man the Church tolerably" in the early seventeenth century on account of the "crowd of illiterate, disaffected, and often disreputable, men in the parishes," is very unsatisfactory from the historian's point of view. At the opening of the seventeenth century there were more undergraduates in residence at Oxford than there are now, and the bulk of these took orders. The practical utility of daily services to-day depends on the hour when these services take place. The mid-day services, chiefly and largely attended by men in great cities, and the quite early services attended by working girls in large numbers on their way to work, more than justify the retention of the rubric. While we agree with much that Canon Henson says as to the essentially Protestant character of the Church

of England and the necessity of maintaining that character, we doubt if his arguments will be received well by either party in the Church, especially at the present time, when the value of all types of Christianity in the combat with evil is receiving full recognition at the Pan-Anglican Congress.

We must draw attention, before passing from the subject of the Congress, to the very valuable little book by the Rev. George Hodges, entitled "Three Hundred Years of the Episcopal Church in America." The author traces with care the history of this important Church, so fully represented at the Congress. The American Church obtained its own succession of Bishops when Bishops White and Provoost were consecrated on Sunday, February 4th, 1787, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the presence of the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and Peterborough. In 1790 a third Bishop (the Bishop of Virginia) was added, "and thus the English succession was fully assured." The American branch of the Anglican Church is now a vast organisation, and it will play a leading part in the Congress that has been called together to discuss the great spiritual and social problems which offer themselves for solution to this branch of the Christian Church.

MONTAGUE BURROWS.*

The autobiography of the man who, after a long and honourable career in the Navy, had the energy and capacity to enter the University of Oxford as an undergraduate and obtain a first class in Greats and a History Professorship, has a promise of interest to be found in few modern autobiographies. This volume has not a dull page. It is lucid, full of information, with just that perfectly honest touch of self-appreciation (never perhaps more warranted than in the case of Montague Burrows) that adds a spice to a man's story of his own life. An autobiography, if it is a good one, inevitably tells a great deal more of the writer than he ever intends, and here we have an unconscious and charming picture of an old man looking back over a great stretch of eventful life without any regrets, and with a tireless appreciation of the changing scenes through which he moved ere he came to the harbourage of Oxford. One might almost call his life the ideal life, for throughout its course everything seemed to develop along the lines most suited to his temperament and genius. He had many advantages from first to last; a family of distinguished record, a fine intellect, an attractive personality, a sound early religious training, and a contented and laborious mind. These gifts will carry most men far. They carried Captain Burrows great distances on two tacks.

* Autobiography of Montague Burrows, Captain R.N., Chichele Professor of Modern History, Fellow of All Souls' College, Officier de l'instruction publique: Edited by his son Stephen Montague Burrows, with a supplementary note by Professor Oman. (Messrs. MacMillan & Co., price 8/6 net.)

The greater part of the book is devoted to Burrows' experience of sea service, and is therefore a valuable chapter in the history of the British Navy. Born at Hadley, in Middlesex, on October 27th, 1819, he joined the Royal Naval College at Portsmouth on August 14th, 1832. In those days half the boys who entered the service subsequently gave up their profession. The life was hard; the "attraction of a great war had gone." His schoolmaster at the College was Dr. Inman, a famous Senior Wrangler. Burrows and Cooper-Key were practically his private pupils. The boys were well drilled at broadsword exercise in the 'thirties, and played rough football, rounders and baseball. Sunday was unattractive, for an old Georgian chaplain gave the boys services and sermons of unexampled dryness. There was little vice or swearing among the boys, but he found on his first trip to Bombay—"five months from "Spithead"—that both were to be found in abundance on active service. The boy was favoured, however, both in his friends and in his commanders, while he was fortunate in his wide range of experience. From Bombay he visited first Mauritius and then Madagascar. It is curious to think that men-of-war at that date on the Indian and South American Stations were allowed to carry freight for merchants. Burrows was in the *Andromache*, under Captain Chads (the father of his greatest friend at the Naval College) and had a curious experience of trading in the East. He called at Pondicherry, where an aide-de-camp to Marshal Ney was Governor, and went on to Madras, and then collected freight to the value of 8½ lacs of rupees on the way to Calcutta. Active service, however, soon took the place of trade. In 1836 the *Andromache* was sent to suppress piracy in the Straits of Malacca. After that desperate business was over they passed on to Singapore and thence to further pirate-battles which must be read about to be appreciated. The following year Burrows re-visited Malacca, and it was not until September 10th, 1837, that he was home once more, with the certificate that he was a "gallant and intelligent young officer." His next cruise was in the *Edinburgh*, under a commander whose career recalls at a distance that of Burrows himself, for he had practically retired from the service, gone to Cambridge and taken his degree when he was recalled to active work. It was a rough ship, and there was much drunkenness, but, curiously enough, one of the lieutenants "allowed me to make use of his cabin, and insisted on my saying "my prayers there morning and evening. Thus the practice of "kneeling at prayers was kept up, and I soon found courage to "do so in the cockpit. I was never interfered with." In the *Edinburgh* he visited Lisbon, Canada, the West Indies, the Levant, (on the occasion of the Syrian War), and thence "the Seven "Churches of Asia Minor." Burrows' account of the battle of Acre (November 3, 1840) is vivacious and well told. The explosion of

the central magazine in the fortress was so terrific (it killed 1,200 men) that it was in a measure responsible for the deafness from which Professor Burrows suffered in later years. "The appearance of the exploded mass was like that of a great waterspout of many colours, reaching to the clouds with an umbrella-shaped cone, out of which flew millions of detached substances, and lasting for what seemed to us some minutes." Dead silence followed; all firing ceased for a quarter of an hour; we were in the presence of something beyond human experience." Burrows passed from the *Edinburgh* to the *Excellent*, and thence to the Royal Naval College, where he was beaten by Cooper-Key in the struggle for the special prize (for proficiency in mathematics) of a lieutenant's commission. Both Cooper-Key and Burrows had been gold-medallists at Portsmouth. The mathematical teaching at the College was not good, though it was under the direction of another Senior Wrangler—Main. "The older mathematical methods, by means of Newton's *Principia* and the old fluxions, would have taught us better the meaning of things. As it was, we did not understand the real meaning of differentials, and were not encouraged to learn." Burrows felt the defeat acutely, but his commission was not long delayed. Before promotion, however, he went to Port Elizabeth with the *Thunderbolt*, carrying troops to turn back the Boer "Voor-trekkers" of 1843. Burrows there joined the *Winchester* as a lieutenant, and passed on to the *Sappho*, in which he saw service on the East African Coast. In 1846 he rejoined the *Excellent*, and stayed in her until 1852. He helped to suppress "the Cabbage-Garden Rebellion" in the South of Ireland. In 1849 he married Miss Gardiner. "Three years after I married I was made commander; and almost immediately afterwards took steps to place myself as a student at Oxford." Burrows' brilliant Oxford career, after his prolonged service in the Navy, came as a surprise to himself, but certainly not to those who knew his genius and his assiduity. The Oxford period is treated very briefly in the autobiography, but it gives us an interesting peep into the Oxford of forty years ago—days as dead now as the days of the *Thunderbolt*.

EARLY ENGLAND.*

The reconstruction of social England in Saxon and Norman times, which we owe to the work of the famous group of investigators that includes the names of Maitland, Miss Bateson, Vinogradoff, Seebohm, and Round, is transforming the social, the economic and the constitutional aspects of life in those times, and

* *English Society in the Eleventh Century: Essays in English Medieval History*, by Paul Vinogradoff, Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Oxford Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, price 16s. net.

is thereby creating a new basis for the writing of English history. Professor Vinogradoff's new volume is a contribution of the first importance to this work, and is a worthy addition to his notable volumes, "Villainage in England" (1892) and "The Growth of the Manor" (1905), and his many monographs on various technical questions. There seems reason to believe that there is a volume on "Town Life in the Eleventh Century" to follow, and if this is so it is to be hoped that Professor Vinogradoff will bring his very special knowledge of Continental material to bear on the problem, and give us an elaborate comparison of the Continental and the English town of that period. It is an unhappy fact that London was excluded from the "Domesday Survey," but it is possible in a measure to reconstruct London from other sources.

Country life in England in the Eleventh Century stands revealed in this remarkable book. Here we have two great essays dealing with "Government and Society" and "Land and People." The division is a just one, and is calculated to make the reader realise the salient forces that bound social life together nine hundred years ago in England. We see what are in effect numerous village communities in various stages of development suddenly vitrified by the administrative methods of a great conqueror into almost infinitely varying manorial types. The Conquest did not create the manor, but it impressed the manorial stamp on all sorts of communities which from before the date of the Roman invasion had been gradually developing territorial lordship and patronage on the one hand, and individual rights, privileges and local political power on the other. William of Normandy found all the materials—the slave, the small freeholder, the thane, the great landowner, the patron, the local courts, the local organisation of military service—for an all-pervading manorial system ready to his hand. He finally fixed the form of this material, checking once and for all the institutional development of the multitudinous social groups with which he dealt, by means of the Great Domesday Survey, which, imposing a tax on all lands that did not supply the king with armed men, bound the various groups to the Crown with a bond not less strong than that feudal bond which bound also to the Crown the lord of each group. Only a very great mind could have undertaken such a task, and only a very great man could have carried it through.

When we look into the society that William brought, unit by unit, into indissoluble union with kingship and central government, we might well imagine that we were examining a far earlier age. We see a country intersected by vast forest lands, such as the wealds of Kent and Surrey, and the great border and crown forests ever growing in extent and in intensity of preservation. In the open forests we find isolated homesteads each with, perhaps, one plough team and two serfs to work it, and with the right to use some cleared space

of pasturage—a dene—where forest keepers and herdsmen dwell in huts. We find, too, small settlements of villains working in the forests wood-cutting and loading wood, or making the hays or hedges that closed in the lands preserved for hunting, or leading to pasture the innumerable swine and goats and horned cattle that found their subsistence on the “mast” of “oak, beech, chestnut, and “other glandiferous trees.” The great woods held in common by this or that manor or combination of manors and townships practically fed the stock, but often enough cattle and swine had to be led great distances to the pastures on which they fed or browsed of right. That was one salient feature of England in the Eleventh Century. “Under the Greenwood Tree” we can watch one whole side of English life. But with the forest land we must class the waste—the vast lands in Yorkshire, Cheshire, the Welsh border, nay, even in Devonshire where the Irish pirates came, laid waste by war, afforestation, castle-building, poverty, or migration. The savagery and poverty of the age had these wild deserts as their monuments. It was one of the chief cares of the successors of William to fill up these waste places with tenants under rich lords, or ecclesiastical corporations, and, therefore, as Professor Vinogradoff points out, “every period of economic and social restoration, following on great devastation, was at the same time a period of “advantage for the growth of aristocracy.”

Outside the forests we come to hamlets and villages, large and small, their character and method of holding, and even their method of farming, depending largely on the particular district. But forest pasturage and wood for building and firing were available for all. The free and unfree population was by the end of the Eleventh Century indistinguishably mingled. “Socmen and *liberi homines* occur in large villages, while villains and serfs are “quite common in hamlets and single homesteads,” and sometimes are the only inhabitants of quite large villages, such as Spalling with its four hundred folk. Nor was the system of farming at all dependent on the status of the farmer. The open-field system of champion farming “is not especially connected either with free “villages or with servile villages: it existed in all the varieties of “rural settlements, independently of the condition of the peasants.”

These communities of shareholders in land, whose strips were “scattered about the fields in such a manner as to combine into “holdings in regular proportions to each other,” had no special status. It is in the township that we see economic administration in its elementary form. It is “not only the fundamental and organic “unit of rural organization; it is also sufficient in itself for economic “purposes, and may exist without any direct interference of the “manor in its affairs.” This independent township actually existed, had its own government and by-laws for the management of the

common lands and the rotation of crops. It is interesting to watch the rural townships developing into towns. "The burgess and the peasant evidently stood closely together, and it was not difficult to turn one into the other." The transitional forms can be clearly traced in the Domesday Survey, and the histories of the town and the township are mutually illuminative. The manorial system adopted the township system as its base. The vill is the rateable unit for taxation and for purposes of local justice and government. It is interesting to note that it is in the vill or township that we trace the origin of the established church. The parish church from the earliest times had its own land, and was a necessary element of the township organisation. It drew from the vill and its inhabitants its burial dues, its land-tax or scot, its tithes in money or kind, and the priest was assigned certain strips in the open field. He was the Mass-Thane and was, as a sharer in the common holding, a regular member of the community and represented it in the carrying out of police, judicial, or administrative duties. He took his place beside the reeve and the representative villain in inquests and on local courts. No doubt he formed part of the staff on a great manor, but the church itself never became manorial property. These few notes will give some idea of the wealth of material contained in Professor Vinogradoff's exhaustive work. It would be possible to write at great length on any one of many themes connected with the great historical problems of which he treats. A brief description of the great manors which formed so important a feature of the land, with their vast organisations, would alone occupy more space than is available. We have been content to try and give some hint of the appearance of England in the Eleventh Century, with its great manorial organisation overlapping vill and village, hamlet and homestead, and superintending the administration of justice, the conduct of agriculture in all its many branches—we read of the brewing of beer, of the making of mead, of orchards, vineyards, fisheries,—the raising of armies, the rendering of service and of geld. From the dry bones of Domesday and the few contemporary documents Professor Vinogradoff has raised up a vision of England as it lived and moved on the day when Edward the Confessor was alive and dead.

MISS COLERIDGE'S POEMS.*

The critic has no more difficult, no more invidious task than the assessment of the merits of contemporary verse. Belonging as he does to the atmosphere of the poet, his judgments have an inevitable bias, and he cannot forestall the judgment of posterity, who alone can

§C. * Poems by Mary E. Coleridge. Mr. Elkin Matthews.

appraise justly the philosophic, the religious, the literary forces that gave shape to the poet's thoughts. Moreover, the contemporary critic is overwhelmed by the mass of mediocre and excellent verse that appears. Hardly a line in ten thousand will survive, for the bulk of verse in any epoch is cast in moulds provided by the major poets of the period. The only safe critical test that a critic can apply to contemporary verse, is the test of thought. Is the poet a thinker who crystallises some emotion of the age into a form that arrests both the heart and the mind? If this test—which, however, may be rejected by posterity—is applied to the poems (now posthumously published) of Miss Mary E. Coleridge, it may be said at once that they contain gems of real value, worthy, indeed, of the great literary traditions of her family. They have received very high praise from Mr. Robert Bridges and Mr. Henry Newbolt—poets and critics of great eminence—and the latter writer has written an introduction to the volume before us. Miss Coleridge's poems represent the efforts of five-and-twenty years, and present the occasional reflections of an observant but mystically-minded woman on the final issues of life and death. An almost intolerable obscurity mars some of the more haunting of the poems, and though we fully agree with Mr. Newbolt that their author is in no sense an imitative writer, yet it is plain that the methods of Samuel Taylor Coleridge have largely tinged her imagination, while the discontinuity of manner that is inseparable from so much of Robert Browning's work is almost wilfully adopted by Miss Coleridge. What are but spots on the sun-like genius of these great men threaten to eclipse the light of her delicate star-like flame. One other criticism is also just, though it is more an observation than a criticism. The volume, taken as a whole, reads rather like an anthology of a school of poets covering a considerable period than the work of one personality. The vivid stamp of a burning personality is wanting. This, perhaps, is due to the absence of the relief that humour gives to tragic thought. Miss Coleridge maintains one tragic level through her poems. The eternal verities are always in her mind. To bring their truth home to the mind, as Shakespeare did by the Knocking at the Gate in *Macbeth*; as Browning did by a humorous dramatic twist of mind in numberless passages; as Coleridge did, again and again in his more famous poems, never seems to have occurred to Miss Coleridge. She never realised that the great peaks in the mountain-land of spiritual life are seen better from below than from above. A certain Greek intensity is the prevailing note; and though she could appreciate it in others, and was personally of a happy disposition, yet, to use her own phrase, she knew nothing in her poems of

“Fun just dancing on the edge of tears.”

But enough of criticism. Many readers of her verse will naturally

resent it when they turn to certain poems that may well outlast this present age, gems such as "At First," "Gifts," "Master and Guest," with its inimitable suggestion of tragedy; "The Witch," obscure though it is; "A Day Dream," "Sun and Storm," "Awake," "In Dispraise of the Moon," "Wilderspin," "Unwelcome," "The White Woman," "Pride," "XCVII," "Where a Roman Villa stood, above Freiburg," "CX," "CXIII," "CXVIII," "CLIII," "The Singing of the Children for Theo," "CLVIII," "Praise," "Rue." Among those twenty odd poems there are melodies and thoughts that are worthy indeed of the poet's ancestry. The lines on "Pride" are characteristic:—

"O mortal virtue and immortal sin,
How often hast thou led the fool aright,
Sent forth a shivering coward to the fight,
And made the worst man win!"

It is impossible not to quote the poem numbered "CXVIII":—

"Thou that canst sit in silence hour by hour,
And know God in His minutest flower,
And watch His myriad ways among the grass,
And feel His touch on every frond of fern,
On the small shadows as they slowly turn,
And on the little creatures as they pass,
What blindness is it that doth hold thine eyes,
Make streets a Hell, and meadows Paradise.
To shut Him out from His great creature, Man.
Hath He not writ Himself in every face?
Awake—and be not impotent to trace
What is and has been since the world began."

The little poem "CLVIII" is a gem of the first water:—

"The sum of loss I have not reckoned yet,
I cannot tell
For ever it was morning when we met,
Night when we bade farewell!"

The final stanza of "Praise" will not easily leave the mind:—

"Alone they safely trod
The flowery mazes
Who loved the praise of God
More than man's praises."

The mental struggle that these poems show between deep faith and deep doubt, between the love of this life, of its sunlight and green places, of its struggles, its sorrows and its joys, and the love of the life to come, is the struggle that eventuates in true poetry, a true statement of the tragic theme. On the one hand the poet cries:—

"What blissful immortality
So sweet as struggling life."

On the other she presses forward into the transcendent presence of God:—

“No gray cathedral, wide and wondrous fair,
That I may tread where all my fathers trod.
Nay, nay, my soul, no house of God is there,
But only God.”

What posterity will think of these poems it is impossible to prophesy, but this at least may be said: they are important, for they give poetic form to that despairing outcry for an explanation of the dark things of heaven and earth that is the voice of a great section of the present generation. It is too near the Greek cry of the first century before Christ to please some of us, but it is full of human tears.

EGYPTIAN PAPYRI.*

The fifth part of the “Oxyrhynchus Papyri” contains perhaps the most interesting material of any of the Fund’s publications. There are three entirely new texts, the first comprising about forty-five lines of an uncanonical Gospel; the second some very considerable fragments of the pæans of Pindar; and the last, twenty-one columns of a Greek historian of the early Fourth Century, B.C., of which about fourteen are in a fair state of preservation. The editors, Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, have adopted, in producing this volume, the same general method which proved so successful in the earlier publications. Each of the new discoveries has a critical preface, which is followed by two texts—one a reproduction, the other a reconstruction; then comes a translation, and, finally, critical and explanatory notes. The result is a book that is both practicable for the amateur and satisfactory to the scholar.

The Gospel fragment contains a denunciation of the Pharisees supposed to have been delivered by Our Lord in the Temple. In tone and substance the passage closely resembles Matt. xv. and Mark vii., and the editors are inclined to regard it as nothing but a second century elaboration of the incident there described. The author, though he goes into considerable detail, is plainly but ill acquainted with the Temple topography and ritual, and throughout calls our Lord $\delta \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho$, both of which facts seem to point to a late date; indeed there is no very substantial argument against a still later one than 200 A.D. (the manuscript is of the fourth or possibly the fifth century). Whatever its history, however, the fragment contains some fine declamation.

In dealing with the second and third texts, the editors had (for

* Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part V. Grenfell & Hunt. Egypt Exploration Fund, 1908.

the last time) the invaluable assistance of the late Professor Blass, whose recent death has inflicted so severe a loss on European scholarship. The Pindar manuscript is probably the most interesting thing that the Egypt Exploration Fund has yet issued, though the large fragment of the "Hypsipyle" of Euripides, which part VI. (to be published in the summer) is to contain, may eclipse it. The manuscript contains fragments of nine poems, some lamentably mutilated, others (notably the sixth) in sufficiently good preservation to enable one to form a fairly satisfactory idea of what the original must have been. Before this discovery no example of the "Pæan" existed, except two known and a few hitherto unrecognised fragments of Pindar and the British Museum Papyrus of Bacchylides. The first seven of the poems in this manuscript are undoubtedly Pæans. The last two may be Prosodia, but there is practically no evidence one way or the other by which they can be identified. The most interesting fragments from the literary point of view are the thirty lines of Number IV., put into the mouth of the personified Island of Ceos, which have a delightful personal note, and the fragments of Number VI. already referred to; this latter has some charming lines of preface, while the story of Neoptolemus (78 to 123) and the address to Ægina (123 to 140) are in the poet's best manner. Other points of interest are the Elucidation of the corrupt Fr. 154 (quoted by Plutarch), by lines 50-53 of Number IV., the confirmation by Number IX. of the Eclipse Fragment (Fr. 107), preserved by Dionysus of Halicarnassus, and the fact that Number IV. is plainly the ode referred to in Isthmian I. (see lines 6 *et seq.*).

The third new text, though of great historical importance, the most important discovery in this field, one may say, since that of the "Athenaion Politeia," is not likely to prove very fascinating to the general reader. In fact, the author, whoever he was, is but a tedious writer. As to his identity, controversy is likely to be long and acrimonious. It seems improbable that he is an entirely unknown author, and there are only two known authors with whom he can be at all plausibly identified, Theopompus and Cratippus. It is known that the Hellenica of the former writer covered the same ground and displayed the same political bias as this work appears to do, but here the resemblance ends, for it is easy to attach too much importance to the linguistic coincidences which have led Meyer and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to accept the identification, and obviously have considerable influence on the editors of the present volume. On the other side, the evidence of style is very strong against the Theopompus theory, and, dangerous as this class of argument is, makes it very difficult to accept Theopompus as the author. The identification with Cratippus must at present fail from the entire lack of positive proof; it is, however, much the most attractive theory, and has the support of Bury, Walker, and Blass.

The period covered by the manuscript is that of 396 and 395 B.C. These years are treated with much detail and a considerable amount of digression. Indeed, the most valuable part of the whole work is a digression on the Constitution of Thebes. Many new details are added to our knowledge of the events of the period, and in almost every case where Xenophon and Diodorus come into conflict the new historian appears to support Diodorus. So striking is the correspondence between them that it seems likely that this writer was one of Diodorus' principal authorities, and this fact may lead to an entirely new valuation of the respective merits of the latter and Xenophon, for the author of this fragment, whatever his shortcomings as a stylist, had undoubtedly exceptional sources of information, a most energetic and impartial mind, and a sincere regard for truth.

The remaining two texts in the volume are fragments of Plato's Symposium and Isocrates' Panegyric. Neither of these is of very much importance, although the former is the longest papyrus yet found at Oxyrhynchus. The latter is unfortunately of very inferior quality, and is of little value except that it emphasises the already acknowledged superiority of the existing MS. Γ . Neither of these MSS. throws much new light on our known texts, though the Symposium fragment is in one or two places plainly superior to any existing MSS. Like their predecessors, they rather tend to prove the antiquity of readings that modern scholarship suspects or condemns.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

The "Short History and Description of Bow Church, Cheapside" (Messrs Elliot Stock, 1s. net), recently compiled by Mr. A. W. Hutton, its Rector, is a really valuable little work which will be of great use to the many visitors to London during the present year. The church built by Wren stands upon an ancient ecclesiastical site. There is reason to think that here stood a Roman Basilica or Court of Justice which was afterwards turned to religious uses. Here before the year 1090 a Norman church was raised, of which the famous crypt, which incorporates some Roman bricks, remains. The Norman church stood upon the arches of the crypt, and hence the name *Ecclesia Sanctae Marie de Arcubus*, or the Church of Saint Mary-le-Bow. The crypt is the earliest Norman building of any size in London. "The glorious Norman church of St. Bartholomew-the-Great, Smithfield, is at least "fifty years later." The present writer is inclined to place the date of the church as early as the time of the Conquest, since before 1190 William Fitzstephen describes the church and its school as possessing traditional and exclusive educational privileges in the city, and it is unlikely that these rights accrued within a century, especially as the school is classed with St. Paul's School and the School of St. Martin's-le-Grand. All three schools were on Roman sites, and it may be that the privileges accrued before the Norman buildings were raised. From very early times the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury in

London was held at this church: hence the title the Court of Arches. As the constitution of the Court was obsolete in 1272 and was re-framed by Pope Alexander III. (the great Pope who did so much for English education) it is probable that it goes back to pre-Conquest times. "In the Middle Ages Bow Church was used, not only for ecclesiastical trials, but also for the publication of Papal documents affecting the Province of Canterbury." Cardinal Pole was invested with the "Pall" at Bow in 1556. Until 1901 the ceremony of the confirmation of a Bishop-elect in the Province of Canterbury was held at Bow Church. In consequence of unseemly scenes the ceremony was then removed to the Church House, Westminster, by Archbishop Temple. The present Archbishop has agreed to restore the ceremony to Bow Church. The volume contains a number of useful appendices on technical questions relating to the history of the church, and is altogether a book that should inspire the rectors or vicars of other historic churches to produce permanent records of the buildings under their charge.

* * *

Among the crop of good books on Socialism which are appearing just now we rate highly Mr. Mallock's ("A Critical Examination of Socialism," Mr. Murray, 6s.). His clear, concise, logical style is very appropriate to a subject which is habitually clouded by vague dreaming, but demands, above all, definite thinking. Mr. Mallock applies himself to the economic theory on which Socialism was founded, and on which it still depends, as a doctrine; and he shows how its political leaders, while unable to maintain its fundamental thesis—that all wealth is derived from labour, i.e., manual labour—allow their enthusiastic followers to cherish that belief. He demonstrates with brilliant logic that it is brain-power which creates wealth. Admitting the great argument of Marx, that justice would give to every man that which he produces, this would ruin the socialistic plea. It is apparent, however, that in dealing with the subject in this way, Mr. Mallock's book takes only a very narrow view of the subject of Socialism as we know it. If Socialism be a dream, dreams are things to be reckoned with, and they may come true. Visions of a kingdom of God in which all men would be brothers have been lights of the world in all ages. Only the discussion of the economic side of the subject must lead us to question whether justice—at all events economic justice—is the true foundation for Socialism or any other social theory. To apply the maxim, "Owe no man anything but to love one another," at once changes the issue. The question then becomes, not "What is a man entitled to receive?" but the much more fruitful question, "What can the man be helped and developed into?" Society needs every man at his best; and if the social organism is to grow it must be by the co-ordinated growth of every cell. Meanwhile, Mr. Mallock's book is an invaluable treatise on one part of the subject.

* * *

"Memoirs of Mistral," translated by Constance Elizabeth Maud (Edward Arnold, London, 12s. 6d. net.)—One of the curious anomalies of the last century, so remarkable for the invention and perfection of machinery, is the revival of folk lore and the dialects in which they were written. The Provençal renaissance, of which this book is a history, was long unknown to the French and English public, but the translation of Mistral's epic poem, "Mireille," into French led to the offer of a chair in the Academy and the award of the Nobel prize for

patriotic literature in 1906. A true son of the Troubadours, born in the classic land of Avignon, "The Virgil of Provence," as Adolphe Dumas called him, has devoted his life to the revival of the "languè" "d'oc," still the language of Provence, and to the preservation of the legends and customs of his native land. Less heroic than the Nibelungenlied, or our own Arthurian legends, the Félibrigs, as the Provençal poets are called, "sang for the shepherds and people of the soil"—patriotism, love of country, and home were the subjects of their verse. The Félibrigs meet every seven years, when a queen is elected, and prizes awarded for poetry, prose, etc., much on the lines of the Welsh Eisteddfod. The portraits of the queens show remarkable beauty—that form of inspiration being evidently not wanting in Provence. The legends and stories are very charming. The memoir is interesting not only from a biographical point of view, but also from the many Greek and Roman customs still preserved. The translation is unequal, some passages being remarkably well rendered—the colloquialisms less so; as "bon diable," which should be "good fellow," not "good devil."

* * *

"The Scot of the 18th Century," by John Watson, D.D. (7s. 6d. net, Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton).—The Scot of the 17th and 18th centuries is known to most of us, mainly through the pages of Sir Walter Scott. Dr. Watson's very pleasant book gives an account of the causes which changed the semi-barbarous country into one of light and leading. The education of the Scot has been severe, but most practical; and it is questionable whether the results are not, even now, the best in the United Kingdom. The influence of the Kirk on the development of the people in these two centuries cannot be ignored. The stern discipline was necessary at a time when only severity was understood, when the old order was changing, and a great rush of industries were flourishing in the land. The inquisition of the Kirk, into the lives of its members, compared by Buckle to that of the Inquisition, claims to have secured efficient rule. The trials for witchcraft, so great a blot upon Scottish history, are given with ghastly detail. Dr. Watson is, however, justified in asserting that the superstition of a century when science was in its infancy is not greater than the spiritualism of the present day. The Kirk claimed to be the colleague of the State in hindering, if not in punishing, crime; and it may be claimed that if she has proved a stern mother, her sons have proved strong men. It is curious that up to the end of the 16th century fasting communions were enjoined, and tokens, evidently survivals of the "Tessera," were used as passports to the Holy Communion; the sexes were separated at public worship, and service books of prayer and hymns were used. These in the 18th century gave place to intermediate sermons and an irreverent worship, described by Burns in his Holy Fair. If Knox, in the 17th century, claimed to have "brought the Lord's people out of Egypt," to Carstairs it was given to bring order out of chaos and establish the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The names of Adam Smith and David Hume, and many others, mark the epoch of intellectual development, rendering Edinburgh a centre of intellectual life. The description of home and country life are very pleasing.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

"Man and His Future: A Glimpse from the Fields of Science," by Colonel William Sedgwick, late R.E. (Mr. T. Werner Laurie, price 8s. 6d. net), is an extraordinary book that startles the reader with theories of life here and hereafter of the most astounding character. Colonel Sedgwick supports his position with an elaboration of argument and illustration that, whether convincing or not, is brought forward with intense earnestness. He sets himself to demonstrate by science, among other things, the essential immortality of the personality—the persistence of our very selves. After death, he holds, "we take on a 'simple resting form'—a non-atomic complex of energies—and in due time this form reassumes a body derived (the conception seems too extraordinary to recite) from the coal-beds which the personality uses as the bud uses the bulb when the winter is over and gone. One is tempted to cast the book aside on seeing such a conclusion asserted, and yet the narrative has a fascination that makes this impossible. It is full of noble thoughts, and does face, in a new and curious way, difficulties that seemed so insoluble to the materialists of fifty years ago. The mystery of matter is really Colonel Sedgwick's theme, and modern discoveries on that subject dazzle the mind. It is certainly reasonable in view of such discoveries to believe (apart from revelation) that the soul is a complex of energies which exists independently of atoms, and that the moral nature has a Master who is not of this world. Colonel Sedgwick works out a consistent scheme of thought which, had it been written as a romance, would have created a considerable stir.

* * *

Mr. John Morley in the preface, dated September 29th, 1881, to his life of Richard Cobden, wrote:—"My memoir of Mr. Cobden 'appears at a moment when there is a certain disposition in men's minds to subject his work and his principles to a more hostile criticism than they have hitherto encountered. So, perhaps, it is permitted to me to hope that the book will prove opportune. It is possible, however, that it may disappoint those who expect to find in it a completely furnished armoury for the champions of Free Trade. I did not conceive it to be my task to compile a polemical handbook for that controversy. For this the reader must always go to the Parliamentary debates between 1840 and 1846, and to the Manuals of Political Economy." These words, written twenty-seven years ago, are even more applicable to-day than when they were written. The extraordinary reaction, based on no intellectual or economic grounds, against the great principles enunciated by the reformers of the mid-nineteenth century is now perhaps ebbing, but the republication by Messrs. Macmillan in their Eversley Series of Mr. Morley's "Life of Cobden" (2 volumes, price 8s. net) will help to re-create public opinion and perhaps will carry the student back to the fundamental debates cited by Mr. Morley.

* * *

"The Royal House of Stuart; from its Origin to the Accession of the House of Hanover" (Messrs. Greening and Co., Ltd., two volumes, 42s. net), by Mr. Samuel Cowan, is a work of great industry and length. It deals fully with the sources of the Stuart family and their relationship to the history of Scotland. Mr. Cowan traces the Condition and general administration of the Kingdom at the Norman Conquest and the Stuart origin. He thence passes to "the supposed ancestors, or progenitors of the High Stewards," to the "General outline of the High Stewards and their official duties," and, lastly,

to the "Administration of the Stuart sovereigns, from Robert II. to the accession of George of Hanover. . . . The history of the High Stewards of Scotland is said to begin with Bancho, who was the grandfather of Walter, the first Steward. Bancho's son Fleance, who was born in 1020, succeeded his father as sixth Thane, and his son Walter, it is supposed, became first Steward." Who this Walter really was is a matter of doubt. Sir James Paul considers the traditional account as to Bancho discredited. For our own part we are disinclined to offer any decided opinion in favour of the above (the Lochabar) origin, or the alternative Breton origin of the family. Mr. Cowan favours the former theory. The first High Steward was Walter, son of Alan the Steward, and in 1158 King Malcolm IV. made the office hereditary. Robert the seventh and last High Steward was in effect the Mayor of the Palace, and on the death of King David he was crowned at Scone, on 26th March, 1371, as Robert II. He was the first king of the Stuart Dynasty. We have no space to attempt to deal critically with this book. It is fully illustrated with portraits; it sets forth many ancient charters, and it is eminently readable. The House of Stuart is of undying interest to the romantic minded, and here they may read at length the unhappy tale, reaching its pathetic height in the woes of Queen Mary and her descendants.

* * *

"The Murder of Agriculture" (The Arden Press, Letchworth), by Sir William Earnshaw Cooper, C.I.E., is an appeal to the people to demand land, tariff, and poor law reform. In certain matters none will be found to oppose Sir William Cooper's proposals. We certainly need some change "which will permit the land to be cultivated in such a manner as to ensure the maximum yield with the best results all round." This, however, is not so much a question of land tenures as of creating a competent race of agriculturists. Great efforts in this direction are now being made by the various rural education authorities. Certainly, too, it is very necessary to deal with the problem of poverty. It can only be solved by educating the rising generation and getting out of their blood the hereditary taint of pauperism. The author of this well printed little book—Letchworth promises to be famous in many ways—is very earnest, but he does not seem to understand the problems with which he deals, if we may judge by his treatment of the relationship of pauperism to our fiscal system. To assert that our measure of pauperism is due to Free Trade is simply to show want of familiarity with that most intricate subject, the History of the Poor Law. When Protection was at its height in England pauperism and want of employment were also at their height. Sir William Cooper refers to the present prosperity of Germany (which in view of the yearly deficit in its budget we do not admit), and compares it with the admitted want of employment in England. We must, however, point out that, in fact, unemployment is not felt in Yorkshire and Lancashire, and also that unemployment is even more acute in Germany than it is here. The Tariff Reform mania at present is making scientific discussion of economic problems impossible. There are no panaceas in economics.

* * *

"Mother Earth: A Proposal for the Permanent Reconstruction of our Country Life," by Montague Fordham, M.A., with a Preface by J. A. Hobson, M.A. (Chiswick Press, 5s. net, privately printed), is a plea for "a large, bold, comprehensive, and genuinely organic reform" of the existing system of land-holding and land-owning. Mr. Hobson summarises Mr. Fordham's views as follows: "Recognising, as all sane thinkers do, the necessity of harmonizing the individualistic and socialistic tendencies which are striving to find expression in our

"institutions, he would leave the actual control of all rural industries to the individual workers, with freedom to co-operate for credit and for other purposes, whilst society in its fullest aspect should own the land and organise the market." Thus individual effort, neighbourly co-operation, and the State, all play parts organically related, in the "work of restoration." Mr. Fordham's proposals as to the State will not meet with ready acceptance. It is, however, impossible here to discuss his economic views. One may say, however, that town life has better sides than are attributed to it here, both by Mr. Hobson and Mr. Fordham, while the morals of the country-side are invariably lower than those to be found in towns. Mr. Fordham's constructive scheme for renewing country life includes the formation of land clubs "in every district, and probably in every parish." The club's first duty "will be to enrol as members, labourers, small holders, village workmen and all others of all classes who are in sympathy with this movement." One business of the club will be to enforce the law as to small holdings that has just come into force, another to deal with the deplorable problem of rural housing. The club must help to educate the labourer in the art of farming and find markets for his produce. The idea of combination among rural labourers is excellent, and we hope it will be put into practice by practical men.

The first three volumes of Dr. G. Campbell Morgan's work, "The Analysed Bible" (Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, 3s. 6d. per volume), consist of general reviews of the text: first from Genesis to Esther, secondly from Job to Malachi, and thirdly the New Testament. The work, we are told, is "the direct outcome of the Westminster Chapel Bible Study Class." Dr. Morgan tells us with truth that the first thing to do in studying the Bible is "to gain . . . a broad and general idea of the scope and main structure thereof. Until this is done the other methods"—the telescopic and microscopic methods—"are not safe, and very much false exposition of individual texts, and of separate sections, is due to the fact that their setting in the whole scheme is not understood. In other words, texts should never be studied save in relation to their context." Dr. Morgan in this general conspectus summarises the various books with lucidity, but whether we have here a method by which the many problems that the text presents can be solved is a question not easy to answer. The synoptic problem, for instance, goes to the root of many difficulties, but it is not possible with Dr. Morgan's method of analysis to present the inter-relations of the texts of the Gospel before the student. On the other hand, we have here a clear, readable summary of the text which will prove helpful to many of those who are now turning from theology to religion.

In the "History of Aythan Waring," by Miss Violet Jacob (Messrs. Heinemann, 6s.), we have a story, the plot of which is laid in Wales. The characters are well drawn, and the reader's interest is maintained throughout. There is a charming description of an old gardener and his garden. It is a story that we can recommend to our readers.

In "The Pulse of Life" (Messrs. Heinemann and Co., 6s.), Mrs. Sellor Lowndes has gathered together a number of complex characters all varying in temperament, and has woven them together in one story with only partial success. The interest flags in many parts, and among so many abnormal and often repellant figures one is glad to meet a simple ordinary being such as Mary Wratten. This book does not indeed show in any way the same careful workmanship as Mrs. Lowndes' powerful work "Barbara Rebell."

NOTES.

The value of photography as an aid to astronomy has been well illustrated in the last few months. Jupiter having been in opposition at the end of January, photographs of the planet and surrounding region were taken with the large reflecting telescope at Greenwich at every available opportunity, chiefly for the purpose of tracing the orbits of the two faint satellites, the sixth and seventh, which were discovered a few years ago. On one of these photographs, taken at the end of February, a keen-eyed observer noticed a speck which seemed to be the image of a celestial object, but not of a fixed star, and on referring to the previous photographs of the month, similar markings were found which were evidently images of the same object. On comparing the positions of these with the positions of Jupiter, they appeared to indicate a small body moving amongst the fixed stars not quite so fast as Jupiter, and the question arose, What was it? It might have been a minor planet, of which there are several hundreds now known, since photography has added so largely to the rate of their discovery, and even in that case the newly found object would have been interesting because there were reasons why it must have been at the time of discovery farther away from the Sun than Jupiter, and the orbits of these small bodies lie generally between those of Mars and that planet.

* * *

The alternative suggestion that it is an eighth satellite of the giant planet seems to be the true one, and the observations are not inconsistent with the assumption that it is moving round Jupiter in the direction opposite to that in which its other satellites move, as is the case with Phoebe, the most distant satellite of Saturn. This last is supposed to be an example of "Planetary Inversion," the hypothesis which assumes that the planets themselves were originally rotating in the opposite direction to that in which they do now, and then threw off satellites revolving in that direction. The planets have since been inverted by the action of tidal friction, and so their axes exist as we now see them. It will be interesting if another satellite is found to illustrate this, but at the moment more observations are required before the new object can be definitely considered as positive evidence.

* * *

The appalling loss of life through famine in our Indian Empire is a matter beyond the ken of the average Englishman. Similarly few people realise the terrible ravages of sleeping sickness. It is believed that two-thirds of the entire population of the Uganda Protectorate, about two hundred thousand, have fallen victims. In a recent communication to *The Times* (April 9th) Mr. H. Hesketh Bell gave a most graphic and pathetic description of the process of the disease. Some relief is afforded to the sufferers by the consumption of flesh meat. He is ready to receive money which will enable him to assist these poor creatures. But more effective and permanent, it may be hoped, will be the work of the bureau which the Government have established to study and combat this fell disease. It was hoped that other countries would combine in this humane effort, and thus enable it to be of an international character. Without wasting time in parleying, the English Government wisely determined to take immediate action, and other students will be encouraged to grapple with this difficulty, and even, if need be, to follow the example of Lieutenant Forbes Tulloch, R.A.M.C., who has laid down his life in the furtherance of the investigations.

The most important book sale of the past season was provided by the disposal of the Gott Library, owing to the death of the late Bishop of Truro, to whom it descended with the family heirlooms, formerly preserved at Armley, near Leeds. Some of the choicest items were sold privately before the remainder, consisting of 324 lots, were sent to Sotheby's auction rooms. The most costly single lot was the Caxton, said to be an unique copy in perfect condition of the Golden Legend by Jacobus de Evragine. It sold for £1,300. The executors suggested that a fine set of King Edward VI.'s Prayer Books should be sold as one whole, but buyers preferred to bid for the single items. Some doubt was cast upon the genuineness of one of the pages in the first issue of the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI., which, perhaps, on that account, was sold for only one hundred guineas instead of more than two hundred, which was expected to be the price. A noticeable feature of the whole collection was the admirable condition of the volumes. Some of the bindings were most choice and rich, but all were good and sound. It was impossible not to regret the dispersion of the library. The choicest lots, however, consisting of the first four folios of Shakespeare, did not reach the reserve price of £3,850. The total sale realised over £12,400.

* * *

Jacopo Bellini, the father of Gentile and Giovanni, was the first to transplant the genius of Florentine art to Venetian soil. Perhaps the best extant specimens of his skill are provided by his books of sketches in the possession of the British Museum. Other works of his are in the Louvre. It is proposed to publish two sumptuous volumes containing three hundred reproductions with descriptive annotations. The edition will be limited to three hundred and fifty numbered copies, upon Dutch hand-made paper watermarked with the painter's name, which will be issued from the house of Van Oest and Co., of Brussels.

+ * *

One of the notable features of publishing during the past few years has been the issue of theological literature at prices which render it accessible to all, whatever may be their worldly means. Originally, this movement was intended as a direct counterblast to the dissemination of rationalistic literature, but its effect rather has been indirect by equipping Christian minds with the necessary knowledge to give a reason for the faith that is in them. Some months ago the *Lay Reader*, a useful little magazine for Church workers, published an admirable classified list, which included no book of greater price than one shilling, as a foundation for systematic study. Since then there have been numerous additions. An important announcement is made by Longmans & Co. of a further move in the same direction.

* * *

Under the editorship of Dr. Dawson Walker, of Durham University, Canon J. C. Wright, and the Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, it is proposed to issue a series of English Church manuals at the price of one penny. Already there is the Churchman's Penny Library, published by Mowbray & Co., but it has been felt for some time that the school of thought which now represents the leaders of the Evangelical Revival has not been sufficiently active in paying attention to the mental as well as the spiritual attributes of human nature. A long list of more than seventy manuals is announced with the names of the writers. It is proposed that they shall cover a wide range of questions of Church doctrine and discipline besides matters of special interest in the history of the Church and her formularies.

The Goldsmiths' Company have made one more generous benefaction to London University in an addition to the Library of a collection of works from the Library of the Earl of Sheffield. It was for the most part brought together by the first Earl, the intimate friend of Gibbon, and is marked by his keen interest and knowledge of political affairs. There is a fine collection of Acts of Parliament of the Commonwealth period. Students of the condition of the country prior to the Poor Law Reform of 1834 will find here an illuminating set of pamphlets and reports. Other collections relating to taxation, and trade, and commerce, have a particular value at the present time when the historical aspect of present-day problems is receiving close attention.

A remarkable addition has been made recently to the library of the United States Congress at Washington. It consists of eighty thousand volumes, relating entirely to Russia and Siberia, of which all but about twelve thousand are in the Russian language. The collection was formed by M. Gennadius Vasilievich Yudin, of Krasnoïarsk, Siberia, during a period of thirty years. Some idea of its extent may be gained from the fact that the manufacture and packing of the five hundred cases, in which the collection was transported, occupied a period of three months, and the Russian Government had to afford special facilities for its conveyance via European Russia. The library is especially rich in works of bibliography, history, and literature. Not merely does it afford the material for a history of the nation, but it also throws much light on local history. In pure literature the collection of texts includes the best edition of every important Russian writer. Having lived for many years at a central point on the Trans-Siberian Railway, M. Yudin has availed himself of the special opportunities afforded to acquire everything in literature relating to that portion of the Empire. He generously placed this collection in the care of the Librarian of Congress at one-third of its total cost. It may be added that M. Yudin retains in his possession a remarkable collection of autographs, said to number hundreds of thousands.

By a coincidence the Librarian of Congress had about the same time the opportunity to obtain a collection of Japanese books, carefully selected by Dr. Kan-Ichi Asakawa. It consists of some nine thousand works, chosen with a view to provide a good "working" collection for the student of Japanese literature, history, and institutions. Many rare volumes have been acquired, but Dr. Asakawa made it a rule not to take out of Japan any important work or document of which there existed only one copy. Special attention was paid to Buddhist literature, and it is claimed that upon the subject of Japanese Buddhism the Library of Congress now possesses as complete a collection of material as can be found in any one library even in Japan. As the library already contained a collection of some ten thousand works of Chinese literature, it is exceptionally rich in these two departments of Orientalia.

Cambridge University Library, however, is easily first among all the libraries of Europe and America in respect of its collection of Chinese books which has been still further strengthened by recent additions. It attained its pre-eminence in this respect by the bequest of Sir Thomas Wade to the University of the whole of his library formed during his long residence in China. The latest purchases to the number of 1,203 volumes fill up several lacunæ, and include 401 volumes of prose works of the T'ang dynasty (A.D. 618-906), forming a companion to the anthology of 48,900 poems of the same period already in the Library.